



Seeing the Non-Existent

Evolution's Myths and Hoaxes

Seeing the Non-Existent: Evolution's Myths and Hoaxes

Copyright 2011 by David W. Cloud

This edition published January 2, 2013

ISBN 978-1-58318-120-1



Published by Way of Life Literature
PO Box 610368, Port Huron, MI 48061
866-295-4143 (toll free) - fbns@wayoflife.org
www.wayoflife.org

Canada:
Bethel Baptist Church
4212 Campbell St. N., London Ont. N6P 1A6
519-652-2619 (voice) - 519-652-0056 (fax)
info@bethelbaptist.ca

Printed in Canada by
Bethel Baptist Print Ministry

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Canals on Mars	50
Charles Darwin and His Granddaddy	52
Thomas Huxley Darwin's Bulldog	84
Ernst Haeckel Darwin's German Apostle.....	108
Icons of Evolution	127
Icons Of Creation	340
The Ape-Men	447
Predictions.....	530
Questions For Evolutionists.....	552
Darwinian Gods	555
Darwin's Social Influence	585
Additional Resources on Creation Science/Evolution....	638

Additional Resources on Creation Science/Evolution

The following materials are available at the Evolution section of the Topical Database at the Way of Life web site:

- Darwinian Racism
- Using Creation Science Materials
- Evolution and Science Fiction
- Bible-believing Scientists
- Creation Science Videos
- Creation Science Books
- Creation Science Ministries: Why the New Evangelical Principle is Dangerous

The apologetics course “An Unshakeable Faith,” which is available from Way of Life Literature, deals with creation science and archaeology in the context of evangelism.

Way of Life Literature
P.O. Box 610368
Port Huron, MI 48061
866-295-4143
fbns@wayoflife.org
<http://www.wayoflife.org>

Canada: Bethel Baptist Church,
4212 Campbell St. N.
London, Ont. N6P 1A6
866-295-4143

Introduction

1. One doesn't have to be a scientist to refute Darwinism.

The believer should not be intimidated by scientists.

Dr. Lowell Ponte, former science and technology editor for *Reader's Digest*, reminds us that scientists are not gods, though they sometimes pretend to be:

“Outside their narrow field of expertise, scientists are often no wiser than the drunk at the end of the bar in your local saloon. In fact they are often more foolish than this drunk, because with the power of science, commissars often become intoxicated with the notion that knowledge and intellect in one field empowers them to speak with the authority of gods in all fields” (“Science Wars,” *FrontPage Magazine*, Feb. 27, 2004).

Phillip Johnson, a law professor who has critiqued Darwinism, rightly says:

“Being a scientist is not necessarily an advantage when dealing with a very broad topic like evolution, which cuts across many scientific disciplines and also involves issues of philosophy. Practicing scientists are of necessity highly specialized, and a scientist outside his field of expertise is just another layman” (Darwin on Trial, p. 13).

In fact, you can be your own scientist. You have the God-given ability to make observations and to make decisions based on those observations. Richard Tedder is an example of those who came to Christ when he stopped depending on his university professors and started analyzing the evidence for evolution and studying the Bible for himself. He told me that when he started reading the Bible he was amazed that everything it said “rang true” because he could see it reflected in life.

We must remember that divine truth has been revealed to the weak rather than to the mighty (Mat. 11:25; 1 Cor. 1:26-28). Further, the “poor man” who has understanding can examine the “rich man” who is wise in his conceit (Prov. 28:11).

The believer has everything he needs to test the theory of evolution: We have God’s Word (2 Tim. 3:16-17) and we have God’s Spirit (1 John 2:27).

Every philosophy must be brought to this Touchstone (2 Cor. 10:5; Col. 2:8; 1 Tim. 6:20-21).

Common sense refutes evolution at every turn. Consider, for example, the concept of evolution through random genetic mutations. Nothing in life works like this. Take a piece of writing, such as Genesis chapter one. It could never be created through random typing, and if accidental changes were introduced to the existing text, the result would invariably be degradation and not improvement. Take a machine such as the Space Shuttle. It has two million parts (and is far less complex than a bacterial cell). Random blind changes would never create such a machine nor improve an existing one. Complicated things are not built by random, accidental events. At the fundamental level, the evolution issue is not rocket science!

2. What I bring to this issue is a strong foundation in Bible knowledge, a call from God, an extensive understanding of end-time apostasy and Bible prophecy, and a passion for research.

I have spent nearly 40 years in intensive study of the Bible and research into errors touching on the Bible. As preparation for writing this book, I have read and reviewed at least 200 books and DVDs, as well as hundreds of articles, and have visited many of the premier natural history museums in America, Australia, and England.

3. Benefits of this book and of creation science material in general

Creation science materials are tremendously helpful in fortifying God's people, particularly young people, against the devil's lies. Titus 1:9-11 says that preachers and teachers are necessary to stop the mouths of false teachers. This is the first purpose of creation science materials. Young people need to see that Darwinism can be rejected because there are no proven scientific facts supporting it.

Creation science materials teach analytical thinking and sound argumentation. The writer of Hebrews says that the spiritual and moral senses must be trained through use.

“But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil” (Hebrews 5:14).

We do not naturally know how to refute error. Like most other things in life, this must be learned and we must grow in it. By learning God's Word and weighing everything in life by God's holy Standard, proving what is right and what is wrong, what is good and what is evil, we strengthen our spiritual and moral senses so that we can know God's will and be approved by Him. Well prepared creation science materials are a tremendous help in this education so that we can learn how to handle the wiles of the devil.

Creation science materials lift the believer's heart to God, the Almighty Creator, and teach lessons about His character and power. “For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead” (Romans 1:20). Everything God has created teaches us lessons about the Creator Himself, and the creation-science issue covers every aspect of God's creation, from biology to astrology. It is thrilling research.

Creation science materials are useful in evangelism. Creation science has been called “pre-evangelism,” and many

people have been saved after first being confronted with creation science arguments against evolution. This caused them to doubt what they had been taught from the secular sphere and to become receptive to examining the claims of the Bible and the Person of Jesus Christ. Consider the following example:

“I was raised in a Christian home, believing in God and His creation. However, I was taught evolution while attending high school, and began to doubt the authority of the Bible. If evolution is true, I reasoned, the Bible cannot also be true. I eventually rejected the entire Bible and believed that we descended from lower creatures; there was no afterlife and no purpose in life but to enjoy the short time we have on this earth. My college years at Penn State were spent as an atheist, or at best as an agnostic. Fortunately, and by the grace of God, I began to read articles and listen to tapes about scientific evidence for creation. Over a period of a couple of years, it became apparent to me that the theory of evolution has no legitimate factual evidence, and that scientific data from the fossil record, geology, etc. could be better explained by a recent creation, followed by a global flood. Suddenly I realized that the Bible might actually be true! It wasn't until I could believe the first page of the Bible that I could believe the rest of it. Once I accepted the fact that there is a creator God, it was an easy step for me to accept His plan of salvation through Jesus Christ as well” (John Cimbala, Ph.D. in aeronautics from California Institute of Technology, *In Six Days: Why Fifty Scientists Choose to Believe in Creation*, edited by John Ashton, pp. 200, 201).

4. Beware of the myth that the Bible has been discredited.

The outcome of a murder trial in a U.S. courtroom requires evidence “beyond a reasonable doubt,” because so much is at stake, and we should require no less on the issue of creation vs. evolution, which has grave consequences that are not only earthly but also eternal.

The Bible claims to be the revelation of God to man, and if the Bible is true, there is an Almighty Creator God and a heaven and a hell; man will live forever in one place or another; and salvation is only through personal faith in Jesus Christ.

This issue is too serious to be decided on the basis of anything other than solid proof that the Bible is *not* trustworthy, yet no such proof exists. In fact, the critics have been proven wrong time and time and time again.

Charles Darwin said, “The clearest evidence would be requisite to make any sane man believe in the miracles by which Christianity is supported” (*The Autobiography of Charles Darwin*, edited by Nora Barlow).

Like many others since then, Darwin FALSELY ASSUMED that the “clearest evidence” is lacking. They have falsely assumed that the Bible has been discredited by modern science and by the “higher criticism” of theological liberalism, but the fact is that the modernistic theories have been repeatedly *disproven* whereas the Bible has been repeatedly *authenticated*.

Those who have maintained faith in the Bible have never been disappointed.

Consider the situation that existed in 1859 when Darwin published *On the Origin of Species*. Theological skeptics such as F.C. Baur claimed that the New Testament was not written until a century and more after the events and that it was based on myths that had taken shape as they were handed down by word of mouth for generations. Skeptics claimed that the book of Acts was filled with historical errors. They claimed that writing was not sufficiently developed by Moses’ time for him to have written the early books of the Bible. This view originated with Andrew Wolf and first appeared in 1795 in his *Prolegomena* to Homer. H. Schultz is an example of the 19th-century skeptics who were promoting Wolf’s doctrine. In *Old Testament Theology* (Vol. 1, p. 25) Schultz wrote: “The time, of which the pre-Mosaic narrations treat, is a sufficient

proof of their legendary character. It was a time prior to all knowledge of writing.”

But it was the critical views that turned out to be mythical, whereas the Bible was authenticated. Those who maintained their trust in the Bible were vindicated.

The critical views about the date when the New Testament was written and about the historical inaccuracies of the book of Acts were decidedly refuted by the renowned archaeologist William Ramsay, among others. As for writing, archaeologists now know that it was developed around 3150 B.C., at the latest, and we have personally seen the evidence for this at many famous libraries and museums. This was more than 1,500 years before Moses and in fact carries us back to the lifetime of Adam by biblical chronology. Since the late 19th century, archaeologists have discovered that the ancient kingdoms in Egypt and Mesopotamia were literate societies full of schools and libraries. Ancient libraries have been unearthed at Ugarit, Mari, Ur, Ebla, Nippur, Nineveh, and elsewhere. (For documentation of these things see the section on “Archaeological Treasures.”)

The skeptics were not only wrong about these things; they were *terribly* wrong.

In spite of this, multitudes have gone out into eternity believing that the Bible is untrustworthy and that evolution is true.

Consider the sad case of Arthur Keith. He was one of the greatest anatomists of the 20th century, but he was duped by the Piltdown hoax. His book *The Antiquity of Man* treated Piltdown as the preeminent missing link. In his autobiography Keith described attending evangelistic meetings and being on the verge of converting to Christ, but he rejected the gospel because he felt that the Genesis account of creation had been proven to be a myth (Melvin Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, p. 59). In reality, the myths were on the side of evolution, and Keith gambled his eternal soul on them. In 1953, he was informed that the Piltdown

fossils were a hoax, but by then he was an old man steeped in humanistic rationalism and a “pronounced opponent of the Christian faith.” As far as we know, he went to his grave in that condition. He should have looked at the evidence for the Bible much more carefully and prayerfully. He should *not* have been so ready to believe what Bible critics and evolutionists taught. The stake is far too high.

I, for one, refuse to stake my eternal destiny on unproven “theories” that are constantly changing. I don’t care if the entire scientific world believes that evolution is true (which is most definitely *not* the case); they must provide real evidence to support their doctrine, and they have never done this.

(For a refutation of the modernistic attacks on the Bible and a defense of the Bible’s infallible inspiration see *An Unshakeable Faith*, which is available from Way of Life Literature.)

5. Evolution is not a “theory.”

We have tried to avoid describing evolution as a “theory.” While many of the men we quote use that term to describe evolution, we do not use it ourselves, and if we do use it we put it within quotation marks. This is because evolution does not rate as a scientific theory or even as a hypothesis. As David Stone, Ph.D. physics, says:

“Scientific theories involve quantitative modeling, experimental data, and repeated validation by prediction and observation. In any aspect of the philosophy / fantasy of evolution, there is no ‘theory.’ There is no theory for formation of the first protein, first DNA, first cellular sub-structures, first cell, multi-celled creatures, transitions between kinds, etc. Just stories. There are no genetic data, not a single observed case of mutations and natural selection producing new, complex tissues, organs, or creatures. Evolution is also not a hypothesis, which is a reasonable explanation of observed facts, consistent with known physical laws, employing experimental data and analysis. It has been tested at least to some degree to see

whether it holds up under certain conditions. A theory arises when a hypothesis has stood up to repeated tests under a wide variety of conditions and cannot be broken. Evolution warrants neither term. Evolution qualifies merely as a philosophical, even a religious idea, void of scientific support, and intended to replace biblical truth with stories” (e-mail to author, August 21, 2011).

6. The evidence for evolution is so flimsy that even many secular scientists disbelieve it.

In 1922, William Jennings Bryan warned,

“It is no light matter to impeach the veracity of the Scriptures in order to accept, not a truth--not even a theory--but a mere hypothesis” (*In His Image*, 1922, p. 94).

Bryan was right, and nearly a century later, evolution remains “a mere hypothesis.” This is plain from the fact that evolution’s major “evidences” are disputed even by scientists who aren’t creationists.

I have many books in my library *by evolutionists questioning the major principles of evolution*. Consider a few examples:

I.L. Cohen, a mathematician and researcher, a member of the New York Academy of Sciences. “... every single concept advanced by the theory of evolution (and amended thereafter) is imaginary and it is not supported by the scientifically established facts of microbiology, fossils, and mathematical probability concepts. Darwin was wrong. ... The theory of evolution may be the worst mistake made in science” (Cohen, *Darwin Was Wrong: A Study in Probabilities*, 1984, pp. 209, 210).

David Berlinski, Ph.D. in philosophy from Princeton and post doctoral work in mathematics and biology from Columbia University. “The structures of life are complex, and complex structures get made in this, the purely human world, only by a process of deliberate design. An act of

intelligence is required to bring even a thimble into being; why should the artifacts of life be different? ... For many years, biologists have succeeded in keeping skepticism on the circumference of evolutionary thought, where paleontologists, taxonomists, and philosophers linger. But the burning fringe of criticism is now contracting, coming ever closer to the heart of Darwin's doctrine" (*The Deniable Darwin*, June 1, 1996).

Michael Denton, Ph.D. in biochemistry from King's College London, Senior Research Fellow in molecular biology at the University of Otago, New Zealand. "My fundamental problem with the theory is that there are so many highly complicated organs, systems and structures, from the nature of the lung of a bird, to the eye of the rock lobster, for which I cannot conceive of how these things have come about in terms of a gradual accumulation of random changes. It strikes me as being a flagrant denial of common sense to swallow that all these things were built up by accumulative small random changes. This is simply a nonsensical claim, especially for the great majority of cases, where nobody can think of any credible explanation of how it came about. And this is a very profound question which everybody skirts, everybody brushes over, everybody tries to sweep under the carpet" ("An interview with Michael Denton," Access Research Network, Vol. 15. No. 2, 1995; the interview was produced in conjunction with the University of California and was the first in a series of interviews with noted scientists and educators entitled *Focus on Darwinism*).

Soren Lovtrup, Swedish biologist and the author of *Epigenetics: A Treatise on Theoretical Biology and The Phylogeny of Vertebrata*. "I believe that one day the Darwinian myth will be ranked the greatest deceit in the history of science" (*Darwinism: The Refutation of a Myth*, 1987).

Richard Milton, science journalist and design engineer and a member of Mensa, has been a member of the

Geologists' Association for over 30 years. "I am seriously concerned, on purely rational grounds, that generations of school and university teachers have been led to accept speculation as scientific theory and faulty data as scientific fact; that this process has accumulated a mountainous catalog of mingled fact and fiction that can no longer be contained by the sparsely elegant theory; and that it is high time that the theory was taken out of its ornate Victorian glass cabinet and examined with a fresh and skeptical eye" (*Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, 1992, p. 4).

Michael Pitman, a chemistry professor at Cambridge. "Neither observation nor controlled experiment has shown natural selection manipulating mutations so as to produce a new gene, hormone, enzyme system or organ" (Pitman, *Adam and Evolution*, 1984, pp. 67, 68).

Wolfgang Smith, Ph.D. in mathematics from Columbia University, mathematics professor at MIT, UCLA, and Oregon State University: "The point, however, is that the doctrine of evolution has swept the world, not on the strength of its scientific merits, but precisely in its capacity as a Gnostic myth. It affirms, in effect, that living beings created themselves, which is, in essence, a metaphysical claim. ... Thus, in the final analysis, evolutionism is in truth a metaphysical doctrine decked out in scientific garb" (*Teilhardism and the New Religion*, p. 24).

Lee Spetner, Ph.D. in physics from MIT, worked with the Applied Physics Laboratory of the Johns Hopkins University from 1951-70. "Despite the insistence of evolutionists that evolution is a fact, it is really no more than an improbable story. No one has ever shown that macroevolution can work. Most evolutionists assume that macroevolution is just a long sequence of microevolutionary events, but no one has ever shown it to be so" ("Lee Spetner/Edward Max Dialogue," 2001, *The True Origin Archive*).

David Stove, Australian philosopher, educator, and author who taught philosophy at the University of New

South Wales and the University of Sydney. “Huxley should not have needed Darwinism to tell him--since any intelligent child of about eight could have told him--that in a ‘continual free fight of each other against all’ there would soon be no children, no women, and hence, no men. In other words, that the human race could not possibly exist *now*, unless cooperation had *always* been stronger than competition, both between women and their children, and between men and the children and women whom they protect and provide for. ... Such cases, I need hardly say, never bother armor-plated neo-Darwinians. But then *no* cases, possible or even actual, ever do bother them. ... In neo-Darwinism’s house there are many mansions: so many, indeed, that if a certain awkward fact will not fit into one mansion, there is sure to be another one into which it will fit to admiration” (*Darwinian Fairytales: Selfish Genes, Errors of Heredity, and Other Fables of Evolution*, pp. 9, 39).

William Thompson, Entomologist and Director of the Commonwealth Institute of Biological Control, Ottawa, Canada. “As we know, there is a great divergence of opinion among biologists, not only about the causes of evolution but even about the actual process. This divergence exists because the evidence is unsatisfactory and does not permit any certain conclusion. It is therefore right and proper to draw the attention of the non-scientific public to the disagreements about evolution. But some recent remarks of evolutionists show that they think this unreasonable. This situation, where scientific men rally to the defence of a doctrine they are unable to define scientifically, much less demonstrate with scientific rigour, attempting to maintain its credit with the public by the suppression of criticism and the elimination of difficulties, is abnormal and undesirable in science” (Introduction to *The Origin of Species*, 6th edition, 1956, p. xxii).

Colin Patterson, senior paleontologist at the Museum of Natural History, London. “The explanation value of the

evolutionary hypothesis of common origin is nil! Evolution not only conveys no knowledge, it seems to convey anti-knowledge. How could I work on evolution ten years and learn nothing from it? Most of you in this room will have to admit that in the last ten years we have seen the basis of evolution go from fact to faith! It does seem that the level of knowledge about evolution is remarkably shallow. We know it ought not to be taught in high school, and that's all we know about it" (Patterson, in an address given at the American Museum of Natural History, November 5, 1981; cited from White and Comninellis, *Darwin's Demise*, p. 47).

The report **"Testimonies of Scientists Who Believe the Bible,"** which is one of the chapters of this book, features 51 Ph.D.s who state that evolution is not scientifically proven. Consider a few examples. Most of these once believed in evolution:

"Despite all the millions of pages of evolutionist publications--from journal articles to textbooks to popular magazine stories--which assume and imply that material processes are entirely adequate to accomplish macroevolutionary miracles, there is in reality no rational basis for such belief" (John Baumgardner, Ph.D. in geophysics and space physics from UCLA, *In Six Days: Why Fifty Scientists Choose to Believe in Creation*, edited by John Ashton, p. 230).

"I reviewed many books on Darwinism and from them outlined the chief evidence for evolution, which included vestigial organs, homology, ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny, beneficial mutations, evidence of poor design, the fossil record, atavisms, nascent organs, the argument from imperfect, natural selection, microevolution versus macroevolution, shared genetic errors, the backward retina, junk DNA, and other topics. ... Slowly, but surely, I WAS ABLE TO ELIMINATE ALL OF THE MAIN ARGUMENTS USED TO SUPPORT EVOLUTIONISM BY RESEARCHING SECULAR LITERATURE ONLY. At some point I crossed the line, realizing the case against

evolutionism was overwhelming and conversely, so was the case in favor of the alternative, creationism” (Jerry Bergman, Ph.D. in human biology from Columbia Pacific University and Ph.D. in measurement and evolution from Wayne State University, *Persuaded by the Evidence*, chapter 4).

“There is not one single instance whereby all the tests essential to the establishment of the scientific validity of evolution have been satisfied. There are hypotheses, grandiose models, suppositions, and inferences, all of which are formulated and reinforced within the collective and self-serving collaborations of the evolutionist gurus. However, none of this amounts to true scientific evidence for evolution. It was in the 1970s that, to my great surprise, bewilderment, and disgust, I became enlightened to this. Up until that time I had not given the evolution matter very much thought. On the contrary, I presumed that researchers committed to the study of evolution possessed the same integrity as that expected of any credible scientist. ... Subsequently, the greatest embarrassment of all was for me to find that **THERE SIMPLY WAS NO VALID SCIENCE WHATEVER**, in any of these numerous publications touting evolution” (Edward Boudreaux, Ph.D. in chemistry from Tulane University, professor emeritus of chemistry at the University of New Orleans, *In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, pp. 205, 206).

“Over a period of a couple of years, it became apparent to me that **the theory of evolution has no legitimate factual evidence**” (John Cimbala, Ph.D. in aeronautics from the California Institute of Technology, *In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, p. 201).

“As I looked at the evidence--trying to be a dispassionate scientist--**I could not find the evidence for the multitudes of intermediate forms which should exist if evolution was true**” (Raymond Jones, Ph.D. in biology, “Standing Firm,” *The Genesis Files*, edited by Carl Wieland, p. 28).

“It is my conviction that if any professional biologist will take adequate time to examine carefully the assumptions upon which the macro-evolutionary doctrine rests, and the observational and laboratory evidence that bears on the problem of origins, he/she will conclude that **there are substantial reasons for doubting the truth of this doctrine**” (Dean Kenyon, Ph.D. in biophysics from Stanford University, “The Creationist View of Biological Origins,” *NEX4 Journal*, Spring 1984, p. 33).

“**I have never seen any evidence for evolution.** All that I see around me in nature points to a divine designer” (Angela Meyer, Ph.D. in horticultural science from the University of Sydney, *In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, p. 143).

“How secure is the idea that there is an uninterrupted creative sequence from the big bang through the formation of the solar system, the solidification of the earth, the spontaneous generation of life, and the evolution of plants, animals, and humans to end in the world around us today? Is this scheme impregnable? By no means. **It has fatal gaps and inconsistencies**” (Colin Mitchell, Ph.D. in desert terrain geography from Cambridge University, *In Six Days*, pp. 318, 319).

“I no longer believed there was any validity to Darwinism, having become convinced of this as much by the evolutionist literature I had read as by the creationist books. **The standards of evidence supporting evolution seemed trivial compared to the evidence on which engineers have to base their work**” (Henry Morris, Ph.D. in hydraulics and hydrology from the University of Minnesota, *Persuaded by the Evidence*, p. 222).

“I have studied a lot of arguments from evolutionists; **I have had seven formal debates with evolutionary professors at universities, and I have never read or heard any scientific fact that contradicts what the Bible says.** There are evolutionist’s interpretations of the facts, but the facts themselves are not contrary to

Scripture” (Terry Mortenson, Ph.D. in the History of Geology from Coventry University, interview with David Cloud at the Creation Museum, June 23, 2009).

“Molecular evolution is not based on scientific authority. There is no publication in the scientific literature--in prestigious journals, speciality journals, or books--that describes how molecular evolution of any real, complex, biochemical system either did occur or even might have occurred. ... In the face of the enormous complexity that modern biochemistry has uncovered in the cell, the scientific community is paralyzed” (Michael Behe, Ph.D. in biology from the University of Pennsylvania, *Darwin’s Black Box*, chapters 8, 9).

“For three years, I used all the evolutionary arguments I knew so well [to debate chemistry professor Dr. Charles Signorino]. For three years, I lost every scientific argument. In dismay, **I watched the myth of evolution evaporate under the light of scientific scrutiny**, while the scientific case for Creation-Corruption-Catastrophe-Christ just got better and better. It’s no wonder that the ACLU (actually the anti-Christian lawyers union) fights by any means to censor any scientific challenge to evolution!” (Gary Parker, Ph.D. in biology/geology from Ball State University, *Persuaded by the Evidence*, p. 254).

“After all the research to date, we are still unable to explain the origin of galaxies as inhomogeneities in the universe from the perspective of evolution. We seem, in fact, to be further away from a satisfactory explanation of evolutionary galactic origins than we were when we started to study the subject, using modern physical theory. **As in one field of science, so in all others, we are unable to explain the origin of the beautiful and complex realities of this world from an evolutionist approach**” (John Rankin, Ph.D. in mathematical physics from the University of Adelaide, *In Six Days: Why Fifty Scientists Choose to Believe in Creation*, p. 122).

“Progressing in my studies, I slowly realized that evolution survives as a paradigm only as long as the evidence is picked and chosen and the great poll of data that is accumulating on life is ignored. As the depth and breadth of human knowledge increases, it washes over us a flood of evidence deep and wide, all pointing to the conclusion that life is the result of design” (Timothy Standish, Ph.D. in biology and public policy from George Mason University, *In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, p. 117).

“If the evolution or creationism discussion were decided by sensible appeals to reason, evolution would long ago have joined the great philosophical foolishnesses of the past, with issues such as how many angels can dance on the head of a pin, or the flat-earth concept. ... evolution is not adhered to on scientific grounds at all. Rather, it is clung to though flying in the face of reason, with an incredible, fanatical, and irrational religious fervor. **It loudly claims scientific support when, in fact, it has none worthy of the name**” (Ker Thomson, D.Sc. in geophysics from the Colorado School of Mines, former director of the U.S. Air Force Terrestrial Sciences Laboratory, *In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, p. 217).

“The principles and observations of true science do not contradict a literal interpretation of Genesis 1, but in fact offer support for the creation of all things in six days!” (Jeremy Walter, Ph.D. in mechanical engineering, Pennsylvania State University, *In Six Days: Why Fifty Scientists Choose to Believe in Creation*, edited by John Ashton, pp. 21, 22).

“I am firmly convinced that there is far more scientific evidence supporting a recent, six-day creation and global Flood than there is an old earth and evolution” (Keith Wanser, Ph.D. in condensed matter physics from the University of California, Irvine, *In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, pp. 103, 104).

“I became convinced that people believe in evolution because they choose to do so. It has nothing at all to do with evidence. Evolution is not a fact, as so many bigots maintain. **There is not a shred of evidence for the evolution of life on earth**” (A.J. Monty White, Ph.D. in gas kinetics from the University College of Wales, *In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, pp. 257, 259, 260, 263).

There is indeed no evidence that a self-replicating living cell could arise from non-life. There is no evidence that mutations and natural selection could account for the vast complexity of life. There is no evidence that man ascended from the animal kingdom.

7. The theory of evolution is a product of end-time apostasy.

The 19th century witnessed an explosion of apostasy. Skepticism was in the air. Theological Modernism, Humanism, and Unitarianism prepared the soil for the acceptance of Darwinian evolution.

Consider some descriptions of this unbelieving atmosphere:

“[It was a time] when speculations about the origin of species were most rife, when even the orthodox doctrines were being modified and complicated until it was hardly possible to know where orthodoxy ended and heresy started” (Gertrude Himmelfarb, *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution*, p. 234).

“Every thinking man I have met with is at heart in a state of doubt, on all the great points of religious faith. And the unthinking men ... are in as complete a state of practical unbelief” (Thomas Huxley, cited from Adrian Desmond, *Huxley*, p. 160).

“The unspiritual condition of the churches ... and the alarmingly prevalent skepticism, infidelity, and atheism among the masses of the people in Germany, Switzerland, and Holland is, without doubt, almost wholly attributable

to the advocacy of these criticisms by a large majority of the prominent pastors and theological professors in those lands. The same condition of affairs is measurably true in England, Scotland, New England, and in every community where this criticism is believed by any very considerable number of people and openly advocated” (L.W. Munhall, *The Highest Critics vs. the Higher Critics*, 1896).

“The flood-gates of infidelity are open, and Atheism overwhelming is upon us” (George Romanes, 1878, cited from Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 371).

“Attendance at places of worship is declining and reverence for holy things is vanishing. We solemnly believe this to be largely attributable to THE SCEPTICISM WHICH HAS FLASHED FROM THE PULPIT AND SPREAD AMONG THE PEOPLE” (Charles Haddon Spurgeon, *Sword and Trowel*, November 1887).

It was within this atmosphere of spiritual skepticism that the doctrine of evolution was born and thrived.

We document this extensively in the book *The Modern Bible Version Hall of Shame*.

8. Evolution is a fulfillment of Bible prophecy and therefore is evidence for the divine origin of the Bible.

Consider 2 Peter 3:3-7. Written 2,000 years ago, this prophecy describes the prevailing naturalistic evolutionary philosophy of our day. The prophecy says that scoffers will come who will deny the global flood and the second coming of Christ. The prophecy charges the scoffers with willful ignorance (verse 5). It says they are motivated by the desire to throw off God’s law and to walk after their own lusts (verse 3). The prophecy describes the Darwinist’s naturalistic, uniformitarian view (“all things continue as they were,” verse 4). The scoffers have a naturalistic faith, rejecting the supernatural, the miraculous, the Divine. As Richard Lewontin admitted, “We have a prior commitment to

materialism. ... we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door” (“Billions and Billions of Demons,” *The New York Review*, Jan. 9, 1997, p. 31).

9. The evidence for God’s existence is irrefutable and only willful blindness accounts for its rejection.

The Bible does not argue for God’s existence, and I believe that we should follow this example. The Bible begins with a statement of God’s existence as the Almighty Creator (Genesis 1:1).

The Bible twice says the atheist is a fool (Psalm 14:1; 53:1). This is because the evidence for God is written in nature and in man’s own heart. See Romans 1:19-20.

The only thing that we should do with the atheist is point him to creation. If he doesn’t believe the evidence that God has put before his very eyes, nothing but prayer will help him. He cannot be reasoned into belief in God through human philosophy. It won’t work and it is a waste of time.

10. We must not lose sight of the the reality of spiritual blindness.

When dealing with the issue of apologetics and when dealing with unsaved people, we must not forget that these are spiritual issues and they cannot be understood without spiritual eyes. We must reach beyond the intellect to the heart and soul and aim for spiritual conversion.

“... and none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand” (Daniel 12:10).

“But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned” (1 Corinthians 2:14).

“But their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the old testament; which vail is done away in Christ. ...

Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord, the vail shall be taken away” (2 Corinthians 3:14, 16).

“In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them” (2 Corinthians 4:4).

11. Man’s will and heart is the real battleground.

The Bible says that man guides his own heart and mind (Prov. 23:19). Man chooses what he will believe, regardless of the evidence. 2 Peter 3:5 speaks of willful ignorance. Peter says that men scoff because they want to walk after their lusts (2 Pet. 3:3). That is their motive for rejecting the holy God.

Aldous Huxley, grandson of Charles Darwin’s “bulldog” Thomas Huxley, wrote, “For myself, the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation, sexual and political” (*Ends and Means*, p. 270). Huxley loved atheism because it allowed him to live as he pleased.

It is not enough to convince an individual that the Bible is true and that Jesus Christ is Lord and Saviour; we must strive to reach the heart and will.

Lee Strobel tells of a man who listened to the evidence that Jesus’ rose from the dead. At the end of the presentation, the man told Strobel that he was convinced that the resurrection is a historical event but refused to do anything about it because, “I don’t want a new master.”

The Bible says that to be saved a man must believe with his heart (Rom. 10:10). Philip told the Ethiopian eunuch that he must believe with all his heart (Acts 8:37). This refers to more than a mere mental ascent to the truth of the gospel; it refers to a heart-felt certainty and surrender.

12. There is a limit to the effectiveness of apologetics.

God gives enough proof to satisfy any reasonable person who is willing to submit to the truth, but not enough to convince the proud skeptic who is bent on unbelief.

People are not the same when it comes to the reception of the truth (Acts 13:7-8; 17:11).

Renowned Harvard law professor Simon Greenleaf observed:

“Christianity does not profess to convince the perverse and head-strong, to bring irresistible evidence to the daring and profane, to vanquish the proud scorner, and afford evidences from which the careless and perverse cannot possibly escape. This might go to destroy man’s responsibility. All that Christianity professes, is to propose such evidences as may satisfy the meek, the tractable, the candid, the serious inquirer” (*The Testimony of the Evangelists*).

The believer must not be discouraged by the willful skeptic and must not waste a lot of time with him. Jesus instructed us not to cast pearls before swine (Mat. 7:6).

13. Theistic evolution is not a viable option.

Probably the majority of professing Christians today believe in some type of theistic evolution. They believe in a Creator God and they believe in salvation through Christ but they don’t believe the Bible’s account of six-day creation and they give credence to evolutionary doctrines such as the ancient age of the earth and the gradual evolution of creatures. Theistic evolutionists who profess Christianity believe that it is possible to reconcile the Bible with evolution, but in reality this is an impossibility.

First, the early chapters of Genesis are written as history rather than poetry or allegory. Second, the teaching of Genesis cannot be reconciled with the teaching of evolution. Let’s look at these in detail:

The early chapters of Genesis are written as history rather than poetry or allegory:

“There are 64 geographical terms, 88 personal names, 48 generic names and at least 21 identifiable cultural items (such as gold, bdellium, onyx, brass, iron, gopher wood,

bitumen, mortar brick, stone, harp, pipe, cities, towers) in those opening chapters. The significance of this list may be seen by comparing it, for example, with ‘the paucity of references in the Koran. The single tenth chapter of Genesis has five times more geographical data of importance than the whole of the Koran.’ Every one of these items presents us with the possibility of establishing the reliability of our author. The content runs head on into a description of the real world rather than recounting events belonging to another world or level of reality” (Walter Kaiser, Jr., “The Literary Form of Genesis 1-11,” *New Perspectives on the Old Testament*, ed. by J. Barton Payne, 1970, p. 59).

- *Genesis is cited as history by Jesus.* In Luke 17:26-32, for example, Jesus mentions Noah, the Ark, the Flood, Lot, the destruction of Sodom by fire, and Lot’s wife. Elsewhere Jesus mentions the Creation (Mk. 13:19), Adam and Eve (Mat. 19:4-6; Mk. 10:6-7), Cain and Abel (Mat. 23:35; Lk. 11:50-51), and Abraham (John 8:39-40). In Matthew 19:5 Jesus quoted Genesis 2:24. Christ always treats Genesis as history, and it is impossible to honor Him as Lord and Saviour and disregard His teaching. In Matthew 19:4-5, Christ mentions both “accounts” of creation in Genesis 1 and 2 and treats them as historical. Many theistic evolutionists, such as Francis Collins, head of the Human Genome Project, claim to be “evangelical” and to honor Christ as Lord and Saviour, but this is not consistent with the rejection of Christ’s teaching about Genesis and human origins.

- *Genesis 1-11 is cited as history by seven of the eight New Testament writers* (all but James). Altogether the first eleven chapters of Genesis are quoted from or referred to 100 times in the New Testament, and Genesis is always treated as historical.

- *Genesis 1-3 forms the foundation of the gospel of Jesus Christ.* If Adam was not a real man and there was no literal Fall, the gospel becomes an empty religious myth.

Jesus' human genealogy is traced from Adam (Luke 3:23-38). We know that this genealogy is populated with the names of real historical people, and there is no reason to treat Adam differently. Further, there is no room within this genealogy for millions of years of time.

Adam is compared to Christ (Romans 5:12-19; 1 Cor. 15:45). It is obvious that the apostle Paul considered Adam an actual man and the Genesis account literal history.

The teaching of Genesis cannot be reconciled with the teaching of evolution as the following shows:

- *Genesis says God created the world and everything in it in six days.* The days of creation in Genesis 1 were regular 24-hour days, days with an evening and a morning (Gen. 1:5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31). This is repeated in Exodus 20:10-11.

- *Genesis says everything was made to reproduce after its kind.* The statement "after their kind" is repeated ten times in Genesis chapter one (Gen. 1:11, 12, 21, 24, 25). This is precisely what we observe in the world. Dogs reproduce dogs, spiders reproduce spiders, birds reproduce birds, and peanuts reproduce peanuts. Animals can interbreed and adapt within kinds (e.g., different kinds of dogs), but kinds cannot be bridged. This is what the Bible teaches and this is what we can observe everywhere in nature, yet evolution teaches that the kinds are not stable, that the fish evolved into the amphibian, and the amphibian into the reptile, and the reptile into the bird, etc.

- *Genesis says the first man was created directly by God (Genesis 2) and was not the product of gradual evolution from the animal kingdom.* The Bible says Adam was the first man (1 Cor. 15:45). And Eve is the mother of all men (Gen. 3:20).

- *Genesis says man is made in God's image and is not a part of the animal kingdom (Gen. 1:27).* Evolution says man is an evolved animal.

- *Genesis says the world was created perfect, then fell under sin and has been deteriorating ever since.* This is consistent

with everything we can observe. Everything is moving from order to disorder. Everything is deteriorating, running down. This is what the Second Law of Thermodynamics describes, as even secular evolutionists admit. Isaac Asimov was an evolutionist, but his definition of the Second Law of Thermodynamics, as follows, actually refutes evolution and proves the Bible: “The universe is constantly getting more disorderly! Viewed that way, we can see the Second Law all about us. How difficult to maintain houses, and machinery, and our own bodies in perfect working order; how easy to let them deteriorate. In fact, all we have to do is nothing, and everything deteriorates, collapses, breaks down, wears out, all by itself and that is what the Second Law is all about” (Asimov, “In the Game of Energy and Thermodynamics You Can’t Break Even,” *Smithsonian Institute Journal*, June 1970, p. 10). How contrary this is to the theory of evolution, which says that things have gradually evolved from chaos to order, from non-life to life!

- *Genesis says everything was designed to fulfill God’s purposes.* Wherever we look in nature, from the microscopic to the astronomic, we see the appearance of design, which is contrary to the theory of evolution, which says the world is the product of blind naturalistic processes. Study the cell, the eye, the ear, the leaf, the flying wing, the atom, light, sound, water--everywhere you find evidence of purpose and design. Dr. Michael Denton observes, “It is the sheer universality of perfection, the fact that everywhere we look, to whatever depth we look, we find an elegance and ingenuity of an absolutely transcending quality, which so mitigates against the idea of chance” (*Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, 1983, p. 342). Even a “simple” microscopic one-celled bacterium (*E. Coli*) contains DNA information units equivalent to 100 million pages of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, and all of that information works together in perfect harmony and is self-replicating! Purpose and design is what one would expect if God created the world as the *Genesis* record says He did, but

if evolution were true, we would find chaos and haphazardness.

- *Genesis indicates that the earth's history is only about 6,000 years old, whereas evolution claims that it is billions of years old.*

Consider the following statement by Bert Thompson. (The documentation, which has been removed from the quotation, can be found in the original article online.)

The truth of the matter is that the Bible, being a book grounded in history, is filled with chronological data that may be used to establish a relative age for the Earth. It is not 'silent' on this topic. ...

The Bible, for example, provides exact chronological data from Adam to Solomon. Combining information from the Assyrian Eponym Lists and the Black Obelisk, the death of Ahab has been determined to be 853-852 B.C. and therefore the reign of Solomon (some 40 years, 1 Kings 11:42) can be dated at 971-931 B.C. According to 1 Kings 6:1, 480 years before Solomon's fourth year of reign (967-966 B.C.), Moses brought the Israelites out of Egypt. The date of the Exodus is 1446/ 1445 B.C.

To this date is added the time of the sojourn in Egypt (430 years, Exodus 12:40), thereby producing the date of 1876 B.C. as the year Jacob went to Egypt. Interestingly, the Bible records Pharaoh's query of Jacob's age (and Jacob's answer—130 years) in Genesis 47:9, which would make the year of Jacob's birth 2006 B.C. (Genesis 25:26). Abraham was 100 years old when he begat Isaac, giving the date of 2166 B.C. for Abraham's birth. The chronology from Abraham to Adam is recorded very carefully in two separate chronological tables—Genesis 5 and 11. According to Genesis 12:4, Abraham was 75 when he left Haran, presumably after Terah died at 205 years; thus, Abraham was born when Terah was 130 years old, albeit he is mentioned first by importance when Terah began having sons at the age of 70 (Genesis 11:27; 12:4; Acts 7:4).

Having established the birth date of Abraham at 2166 B.C. (Archer, 1970, pp. 203-204), it is possible to work from the time of Adam's creation to Abraham in order to discern the chronology of 'the beginning.' The time from the creation of Adam to Seth was 130 years (Genesis 5:3), the time from Adam to Noah was 1056 years (Packer, et al., 1980, pp. 56-57), and the time from Noah's birth to the Flood was 600 years (Genesis 7:6), or 1656 A.A. (After Adam). It appears that Shem was about 100 years old at the time of the Flood (Genesis 5:32; 11:10) and begat Arphaxad two years after the Flood (the Earth was not dry for more than a year; cf. Genesis 7:11 with 8:14; see also Genesis 11:10) in approximately 1659 A.A.

Arphaxad begat Salah in his thirty-fifth year; however, Luke 3:36 complements the chronological table of Genesis 11 with the insertion of Cainan between Arphaxad and Salah, which indicates that likely Arphaxad was the father of Cainan. Proceeding forward, one observes that Terah was born in 1879 A.A., and bore Abraham 130 years later (in the year 2009 A.A.). Simple arithmetic—2166 B.C. added to 2009 A.A.—would place the creation date at approximately 4175 B.C. The Great Flood, then, would have occurred around 2519 B.C. (i.e., 1656 A.A.).

Numerous objections have been leveled at the literal and consecutive chronological interpretation of Scripture. For example, some have suggested that the tables of Genesis 5 and 11 are neither literal nor consecutive. Yet five of the Patriarchs clearly were the literal fathers of their respective sons: Adam named Seth (Genesis 4:25), Seth named Enos (4:26), Lamech named Noah (5:29), Noah's sons were Shem, Ham and Japheth (cf. 5:32 with 9:18), and Terah fathered Abraham directly (11:27,31). Jude's record in the New Testament counts Enoch as 'the seventh from Adam' (Jude 1:14), thereby acknowledging the genealogical tables as literal and consecutive. Moreover, how better could Moses have expressed a literal and consecutive genealogy than by using the terms

'lived...and begat...begat...after he begat...all the days... and he died'? Without question, Moses noted that the first three individuals (Adam, Seth, and Enos) were consecutive, and Jude stated by inspiration that the first seven (to Enoch) were consecutive. Enoch's son, Methuselah, died the year of the Flood, and so by three steps the chronology of Adam to Noah is literal and consecutive, producing a trustworthy genealogy/chronology.

There have been those who have objected to the suggestion that God is concerned with providing information on the age of the Earth and humanity. But the numerous chronological tables permeating the Bible prove that theirs is a groundless objection. God, it seems, was very concerned about giving man exact chronological data and, in fact, was so concerned that He provided a precise knowledge of the period back to Abraham, plus two tables—with ages—from Abraham to Adam. The ancient Jewish historians (1 Chronicles 1:1-27) and the New Testament writers (Luke 3:34-48) understood the tables of Genesis 5 and 11 as literal and consecutive. The Bible explains quite explicitly that God created the Sun and Moon to be timekeepers (Genesis 1:16) for Adam and his descendants (notice how Noah logged the beginning and the ending of the Flood using these timekeepers, Genesis 7:11; 9:14). ...

While it is true that genealogies (and chronologies) serve various functions in Scripture, one of their main purposes is to show the historical connection of great men to the unfolding of Jehovah's redemptive plan. These lists, therefore, are a link from the earliest days of humanity to the completion of God's salvation system. In order to have any evidential value, they must be substantially complete (Bert Thompson, "The Bible and the Age of the Earth," August 1999, <http://www.apologeticspress.org/articles/85>).

Various biblical dating chronologies differ slightly--a few years here or even a hundred years there--but no biblical

dating chronology allows for a date of creation older than several thousand years.

- *Genesis says man had the ability to use language from the beginning, so that he might communicate with God.* But according to evolution, language evolved from animal grunts and squeals. It is important to understand that even modern archaeology says that writing began about 5,000 years ago, which fits the Bible's record exactly (Joseph Naveh, *Origins of the Alphabets: Introduction to Archaeology*, Jerusalem: The Jerusalem Publishing House, p. 6).

- *Genesis says man had the ability to create an intelligent civilization from the very beginning.* Adam's first children built cities, raised cattle, created musical instruments, and worked in brass and iron (Gen. 4:17-22). Evolution, on the other hand, claims that man's civilization began with a "stone age" during which "cave men" lived like animals.

14. Most people, even the most educated, know little about evolution and are not prepared to defend it.

The Bible believer does not need to be intimidated by evolutionists. They are usually ill prepared to defend it.

High school biology textbooks deal with the subject almost in passing and typically toss out a few of the shopworn icons--such as the embryo and horse charts, the Miller experiment, and fruit fly mutations--that are refuted in this course.

On a flight from San Diego to Seattle in 2010, I had a conversation with a Ph.D. candidate in biology, and he admitted to me that the only thing he knew about Darwinian evolution is the little he learned in college biology textbooks. Though he believed it, he was unprepared to defend it.

The Christian who studies the facts presented in this book will be more knowledgeable about Darwinian evolution than the vast percentage of people he will meet along life's way.

15. Darwin and his followers use a bait and switch technique.

The bait and switch routine is used continually. They try to prove the evolution of creatures, such as a reptile turning into a bird, from evidence of minor changes within species, such as different types of beaks on finches or different colorings of peppered moths or the change in the eating habit of a caterpillar or the adaptation of a bacterium.

Adaptation within species is dramatically different from the changes required for the creation of new kinds of creatures. The difference has been referred to as “microevolution” vs. “macroevolution,” but we are not happy with the term “microevolution” since it falsely implies that some type of real evolution is happening.

Darwin pointed to the variety among pigeons to prove that “natural selection” can produce changes. Yet there is zero evidence that such modifications can change a pigeon into something else, or that such modifications can create a wing or produce flight. This is to compare apples to oranges.

Darwin’s book *On the Origin of Species* is a masterpiece of bait and switch. He gave no evidence that species could originate through his theory. As James Perloff says, “Darwin’s *On the Origin of Species* discussed *survival* of the fittest--but not *arrival* of the fittest” (*Tornado in a Junkyard*, p. 47).

16. The term “science” must be clearly defined.

It is important to understand that there are two types of “science” practiced today: *operational* (or empirical or observational) and *historical*.

“Operational science deals with testing and verifying ideas in the present and leads to the production of useful products like computers, cars, and satellites. Historical (origins) science involves interpreting evidence from the past and includes the models of evolution and special creation. Recognizing that everyone has presuppositions that shape the way they interpret the evidence is an

important step in realizing that historical science is not equal to operational science. Because no one was there to witness the past (except God), we must interpret it based on a set of starting assumptions” (Roger Patterson, *Evolution Exposed*, p. 20).

Scientists have accomplished wonderful things through empirical science, such as building technological devices and exploring the living cell, but when they try to look beyond the physical world and beyond the constraints of time, they enter into a sphere about which they are not qualified to speak. They leave the evidence and enter into speculation.

For example, the February 5, 2004 issue of *Japan Nanonet Bulletin* featured an interview with Dr. Keiichi Namba, professor, Graduate School of Frontier Biosciences, Osaka University, on the flagellum motor. Notice the introductory paragraph:

“**Nature created** a rotary motor with a diameter of 30 nm. Motility of bacteria, such as Salmonella and E. coli with a body size of 1-2 microns, is driven by rapid rotation of a helical propeller by such a tiny little motor at its base. This organelle is called the flagellum, made of a rotary motor and a thin helical filament that grows up to about 15 microns. It rotates at around 2,000 rpm ... and with energy conversion efficiency close to 100%.”

This paragraph is a mixture of empirical and historical science. The description of the flagellum motor is based on observational science, but the statement that “nature created” this motor is not based on any scientific evidence. It is pure speculation based on evolutionary assumption. The *Japan Nanonet Bulletin* is qualified to report on the construction of biological nano motors, but it is not qualified to tell us how these motors came into existence. For that, we must look beyond man’s mind. We must look to God and His divine Revelation.

17. Evolution is based upon assumptions.

One thing that will become evident in this course is that evolution is based upon unproven assumptions. If evolutionists are not allowed to assume their doctrine, they have no evidence.

In 1887, John Dawson wisely observed:

“Let the reader take up either of Darwin’s great books, or Spencer’s ‘Biology,’ and merely ask himself as he reads each paragraph, ‘What is assumed here and what is proved?’ and he will find the whole fabric melt away like a vision” (John William Dawson, *The Story of Earth and Man*, 1887, p. 330).

Dawson was correct, and nothing has changed in this regard since his day.

Consider some examples:

Homology

One of the most-used icons of evolution is homology or similarity between creatures, limbs, and organs. Darwin made so much of homology that he said that it would cause him to believe in evolution even if there was no other evidence.

Practically every modern biology textbook and every natural history museum uses homology as a chief evidence for evolution. For example, the Prentice Hall *Biology* 2002 textbook features a drawing of a limb of a turtle, an alligator, a bird, and a mammal accompanied by the following note, “[These] homologous structures ... provide evidence of a common ancestor whose bones may have resembled those of the ancient fish shown here.”

In reality, the similarity of limbs, such as the bone structure of a human arm, an alligator’s leg, and a bird’s wing, provides *zero* evidence for evolution, unless one assumes that evolution has occurred. Similarity of structures is not evidence for common descent nor evidence against common design. Who is to say scientifically that the limbs were not

created for their individual purposes and that the similarities of form exist because these function best to fulfill a variety of needs? It would be reasonable for the creator to use similar structures and processes in creatures designed to live in the same environment.

Radiometric Dating

Dr. Don DeYoung, in *Thousands Not Billions*, shows that radiometric dating techniques are based on evolutionary assumptions, and if the assumptions are wrong the dates will also be wrong.

The Big Bang

The only reason evolutionists think they can trace an expanding universe back to a “singularity,” is because they assume there was no creation 6,000 years ago. Like radiometric dating methods, the Big Bang is premised upon an evolutionary “uniformitarian” view of the universe that denies divine creation *a priori*. Astrophysicist George Ellis admits that “there is a range of models that could explain the observations” (W. Wayt Gibbs, “Profile: George F. R. Ellis,” *Scientific American*, Oct. 1995, p. 55). Ellis admits that evolutionists “are using philosophical criteria in choosing our models” and that “a lot of cosmology tries to hide that.”

The fossil record as evidence of descent with modification

All supposed evidence for evolution from the fossil record is mere assumption. It is impossible to prove scientifically that one fossilized creature evolved from another. This was admitted by Colin Patterson of the British Natural History Museum:

“THERE IS NOT ONE SUCH FOSSIL FOR WHICH ONE COULD MAKE A WATERTIGHT ARGUMENT [as transitional]. The reason is that statements about ancestry and descent are not applicable in the fossil record. Is *Archaeopteryx* the ancestor of all birds? Perhaps yes, perhaps no: there is no way of answering the question. 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” (Colin Patterson, letter to Luther Sunderland, April 10, 1979, cited from Sunderland’s *Darwin’s Enigma*, pp. 101, 102).

Transposons are evolutionary remnants of ancient viruses.

For years transposons in the DNA were “almost universally interpreted by evolutionary scientists as remnants of ancient viruses.” Transposons are segments of DNA that “utilize cellular machines to replicate themselves and then splice the copies back into the host DNA” (Brian Thomas, “Science Overturns Evolution’s Best Arguments,” Institute for Creation Research, Dec. 29, 2009). Since chimpanzees and humans share some transposons, this was supposed to be evidence that the transposons were created by the same virus before the two “species” diverged from an ape-like ancestor. It is now known that transposons contain functional code that is useful to the organism and are not mere evolutionary “junk,” which is solid scientific evidence against the evolutionary assumption. There was no real evidence all along. The facts were merely interpreted through evolutionary assumptions and those assumptions were then used as evidence for evolution!

Armed with the knowledge that evolutionists assume their doctrine to be true and conduct their “science” on this basis, the Bible believer will not be led astray by evolutionary media presentations, whether in print, in museums, on the web, or in documentaries.

For example, the National Geographic documentary *The Known Universe 2* examines the “evidence” for extra-terrestrial life. With its spectacular graphics and interviews with scientists with impressive credentials, it has the air of great scientific authority, but it lacks real substance. In reality, it is based upon evolutionary assumptions combined with speculation. Some major assumptions are as follows:

- *Life evolved on earth; therefore, life could evolve elsewhere.* “With billions of stars out there, surely there’s life.” This is mere assumption.

- *Inert molecules can form life if a liquid is present to agitate them; therefore, life could form elsewhere if liquid water or even liquid methane is present.* “Molecules must move around and interact to form the chemistry for life. Liquid allows the atoms to mix together to form the building blocks of life.” This is mere assumption. In fact, as Dr. David Stone says, “It’s even worse. It’s just word games. No one has ever offered a system of chemical reactions, a proposed scientific model, at all. There is no science to support this.”

- *Since life exists in harsh environments on earth this means life can evolve in harsh environments elsewhere.* “We have to understand that life will evolve under conditions that are horribly hostile.” This is mere assumption.

- *Life on earth formed by adapting to the environment; therefore, extra-terrestrial life will be adapted to its environment.* “Over hundreds of millions of years all of the life forms on our planet have adapted to their environment.” Scientists are quoted as imagining that life on a high gravity planet would be squat and have many thick legs, whereas life on a low-gravity planet would be spindly like a spider. It is pure assumption and speculation.

18. Scientists are highly motivated *not* to criticize evolution.

This is because Darwinian evolution is the religion of modern science and it is not acceptable to question it. Many have lost promotions and jobs and been denied degrees, awards, and grants for even questioning evolution, not to speak of rejecting it.

The video documentary *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed* by Ben Stein examines the persecution of scientists and professors who dare to question Darwinism or to promote even the slightest evidence for intelligent design.

In *Slaughter of the Dissidents* (Southworth, WA: Leafcutter Press, 2008), Jerry Bergman (Ph.D. in human biology from Columbia Pacific University and Ph.D. in measurement and evaluation from Wayne State University) tells the “shocking truth about killing the careers of Darwin doubters.” In the Introduction, John Eidsmoe says: “In this fascinating book, Dr. Jerry Bergman--himself a victim--chronicles the history of modern religious persecution in America. A highly respected, credentialed, and published professor, he was denied tenure--and subsequently fired--admittedly because of his creationist beliefs and writings. Dr. Bergman describes numerous other cases, often concealing names to protect those who do not wish to risk losing their current positions (a common means of persecuting those with minority views)” (p. xv).

Dr. Bergman testifies:

“[A] factor that moved me to the creationist side was the underhanded, often totally unethical techniques that evolutionists typically used to suppress dissonant ideas, primarily creationism. Rarely did they carefully and objectively examine the facts, but usually focused on suppression of creationists, denial of their degrees, denial of their tenure, *ad hominem* attacks, and in general, irrational attacks on their person. In short, their response in general was totally unscientific and one that reeks of intolerance, even hatred” (*Persuaded by the Evidence*, chapter 4).

William Dembski adds:

“As Michael Behe pointed out in an interview with the *Harvard Political Review* for a biologist to question Darwinism endangers one’s career. ‘There’s good reason to be afraid. Even if you’re not fired from your job, you will easily be passed over for promotions. I would strongly advise graduate students who are skeptical of Darwinian theory not to make their views known.’ ... Doubting Darwinian orthodoxy is comparable to

opposing the party line of a Stalinist regime. ... Overzealous critics of intelligent design regard it as their moral duty to keep biology free from intelligent design, even if that means taking extreme measures. I've known such critics to contact design theorists' employers and notify them of the 'heretics' in their midst. Once 'outed,' the design theorists themselves get harassed and harangued with e-mails. Next, the press does a story mentioning their unsavory intelligent design associations. (The day one such story appeared, a close friend and colleague of mine mentioned in the story was dismissed from his research position at a prestigious molecular biology laboratory. He had worked in that lab for ten years. ... Welcome to the inquisition" (*The Design Revolution*, pp. 304, 305).

Walt Brown, who has a Ph.D. in mechanical engineering from MIT, describes the way that evolutionists have controlled the scientific fields since the day of Thomas Huxley. He uses the field of geology as an example:

"Professors in the new and growing field of geology were primarily selected from those who supported the anti-catastrophe principle. These professors did not advance students who espoused catastrophes. An advocate of a global flood was branded a 'biblical literalist' or 'fuzzy thinker'--not worthy of an academic degree. Geology professors also influenced, through the peer review process, what papers could be published. Textbooks soon reflected their orthodoxy, so few students became 'fuzzy thinkers.' This practice continues to this day, because a major criterion for selecting professors is the number of their publications" (*In the Beginning*, p. 253).

Consider Dr. Caroline Crocker, a cell-biologist and full-time visiting faculty member at George Mason University. After she showed several slides about intelligent design in a class on cells, she was reprimanded, pulled from lecture duties, and her contract was not renewed the following semester. She testified: "Students are not allowed to question

Darwinism. There are universities where they poll students on what they believe and single them out.”

Some Darwinists have even hinted at or openly called for the imprisonment of creationists.

“Richard Dawkins has written that anyone who denies evolution is either ‘ignorant, stupid or insane (or wicked--but I’d rather not consider that)’ (*New York Times*, April 9, 1989, sec. 7, p. 34). It isn’t a big step from calling someone wicked to taking forceful measures to put an end to their wickedness. John Maddox, the editor of *Nature*, has written in his journal that ‘it may not be long before the practice of religion must be regarded as anti-science’ (‘Defending Science Against Anti-Science,’ *Nature*, 368, 185). In his recent book *Darwin’s Dangerous Idea*, philosopher Daniel Dennett compares religious believers--90 percent of the population--to wild animals who may have to be caged, and he says that parents should be prevented (presumably by coercion) from misinforming their children about the truth of evolution, which is so evident to him” (Michael Behe, *Darwin’s Black Box*, chapter 11).

As a response to this persecution, IDEA was founded in 2001. It stands for Intelligent Design and Evolution Awareness. It seeks to promote the free discussion of ID and has encouraged the establishment of clubs on college and high school campuses.

19. Evolution is a religion that has been biased against the Bible and the God of the Bible from its inception; it is more about rejecting God than it is about science.

In 2000, Dr. Michael Ruse wrote:

Paul Beck is one of many scientists who have rejected evolution after discovering that it is more about metaphysics than physics.

“My studies led me to the ever greater conviction that evolutionism was a deeply flawed theory sustained not by science, but by those who were determined to find any

explanation--no matter how absurd--that banished God from the scene" (Paul Beck, doctorate in engineering science from Oxford, *Persuaded by the Evidence*, p. 117).

The presentation of evolution as an alternative metaphysical faith began with the fathers of the modern evolutionary theories.

Charles Lyell (1799-1873), the father of geological uniformitarianism which became a bedrock of evolution, hated the literal interpretation of the book of Genesis and hoped to use his uniformitarian theory to drive men "out of the Mosaic record" (*Life, Letters, and Journals of Sir Charles Lyell*, I, pp. 253, 256, 328).

Charles Darwin hated the Bible and the God of the Bible. In his *Autobiography* he said that the Bible "was no more to be trusted than the sacred books of the Hindoos, or the beliefs of any barbarian" and called the doctrine of eternal torment a damnable doctrine (pp. 85, 87).

Thomas Huxley, who had a major role in the popularizing of Darwinian evolution, was very bold in his rejection of the Bible. He mocked biblical creation in *Zoological Evidences as to Man's Place in Nature* (1863) and *The Physical Basis of Life* (1868). In 1893, Huxley boasted, "... history records that whenever science and [biblical] orthodoxy have been fairly opposed, the latter has been forced to retire from the lists, bleeding and crushed if not annihilated; scotched, if not slain." In his correspondence Huxley viciously said of Bible believers who resisted Darwinism, "I should like to get my heel into their mouths and scr-r-unch it round" (Lord Ernie, "Victorian Memoirs and Memories," *The Quarterly Review*, 1923; cited from Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 363).

Ever since Darwin and Huxley, the evolutionary establishment has been committed to a naturalistic anti-God viewpoint and has been aligned solidly against the Bible.

It was to avoid the implications of biblical creationism and the God of the Bible that scientists like Fred Hoyle and Francis Crick and Richard Dawkins came to believe in space

aliens. Michael Behe says, “The primary reason Crick subscribes to this unorthodox view [life was seeded on earth by aliens] is that he judges the undirected origin of life to be a virtually insurmountable obstacle, but he wants a naturalistic explanation” (*Darwin’s Black Box*, chapter 11).

Consider some statements that reflect the religious aspect of evolution:

“Darwin’s real achievement was to remove the whole idea of God as the Creator of organisms from the sphere of rational discussion” (Julian Huxley, grandson of Thomas Huxley, Keynote address, Darwin Centennial, 1959).

“Let me summarize my views on what modern evolutionary biology tells us loud and clear. ... There are no gods, no purposes, no goal-directed forces of any kind. There is no life after death. ... There is no ultimate foundation for ethics, no ultimate meaning to life, and no free will for humans, either” (William Provine, biology professor at Cornell University, *Origins Research*, 1994, quoted from *In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, p. 379).

“Man stands alone in the universe, a unique product of a long, unconscious, impersonal, material process with unique understanding and potentialities. These he owes to no one but himself, and it is to himself that he is responsible. He is ... his own master. He can and must decide and manage his own destiny” (George Simpson, *Life of the Past*, 1953, p. 155).

“Our willingness to accept scientific claims that are against common sense is the key to an understanding of the real struggle between science and the supernatural. We take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, in spite of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories, because **we have a prior commitment, a commitment to materialism.** It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the

phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our *a priori* adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is an absolute, for **we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door**" (Richard Lewontin, "Billions and Billions of Demons," *The New York Review*, Jan. 9, 1997, p. 31; Lewontin was reviewing Carl Sagan's *The Demon-Haunted World*).

"I have never liked the idea of divine tinkering: for me it is much more inspiring to believe that a set of mathematical laws can be so clever as to bring all these things into being" (Paul Davies, cited by Clive Cookson, "Scientists Who Glimpsed God," *Financial Times*, April 29, 1995, p. 20).

"Some future day may yet arrive when all reasonable chemical experiments run to discover a probable origin for life have failed unequivocally. Further, new geological evidence may indicate a sudden appearance of life on the earth. Finally, we may have explored the universe and found no trace of life, or process leading to life, elsewhere. In such a case, some scientists might choose to turn to religion for an answer. Others, however, myself included, would attempt to sort out the surviving less probable scientific explanations in the hope of selecting one that was still more likely than the remainder" (Robert Shapiro, *Origins: A Skeptic's Guide*).

"Thus, science welcomes the possibility of evolution resulting from forces beyond natural selection. Yet those forces must be natural; they cannot be attributed to the actions of mysterious creative intelligences whose existence, in scientific terms, is unproved" ("15 Answers to Creationist Nonsense," *Scientific American*, July 2002).

"Even if all the data point to an intelligent designer, such an hypothesis is excluded from science because it is not naturalistic" (Scott Todd, immunologist at Kansas State

University, correspondence to *Nature*, Sept. 30, 1999, www.answersingenesis.org/todd).

The fact that evolution is an alternative metaphysical faith explains why that even when its pet theories are proven wrong, it refuses to consider the biblical account. For example, Lyell's uniformitarianism has been replaced with catastrophic views such as the moving of continents by plate tectonics, the destruction of dinosaurs by meteorites, and the creation of the Grand Canyon by flooding through the breaching of an ancient lake, all of which are a repudiation of uniformitarianism. Geologist Davis A. Young observes, "The geologic community gave up substantive uniformitarianism long ago." But at no point do evolutionists consider the possibility that the Bible's account of a worldwide Flood might, in fact, be true. The reason is that they are committed to a naturalistic religion.

20. Science has not answered *any* of the important questions of life.

Science has staked out a near-God status in modern society, but in reality it cannot answer any of the important questions of life:

- Where did the universe come from?
- Where did life come from?
- What is man?
- Why is man so different from the other creatures?
- Why does man have a sense of morality?
- Is there a purpose to human life?
- Is there a God?
- If so, who is He?
- How can we know Him?
- What lies beyond death?
- What is human consciousness and where did it come from?

David Berlinski is a Jewish agnostic, but he understands that modern science does not hold the answers to life:

“If science stands opposed to religion, it is not because of anything contained in either the premises or the conclusions of the great scientific theories. ... We know better than we did what we do not know and have not grasped. We do not know how the universe began. We do not know why it is there. Charles Darwin talked speculatively of life emerging from a ‘warm little pond.’ The pond is gone. We have little idea how life emerged, and cannot with assurance say that it did. We cannot reconcile our understanding of the human mind with any trivial theory about the manner in which the brain functions. Beyond the trivial, we have no other theories. We can say nothing of interest about the human soul. We do not know what impels us to right conduct or where the form of the good is found” (David Berlinski, *The Devil’s Delusion*, pp. xiv, xv).

“The hypothesis that we are nothing more than cosmic accidents has been widely accepted by the scientific community. Figures as diverse as Bertrand Russell, Jacques Monod, Steven Weinberg, and Richard Dawkins have said it is so. It is an article of their faith, one advanced with the confidence of men convinced that nature has equipped them to face realities the rest of us cannot bear to contemplate. There is not the slightest reason to think this is so” (Berlinski, p. xvi).

21. Evolution is elastic and is never refuted in the eyes of convinced Darwinists.

Darwinists have an answer for everything. If it is demonstrated that evolution is not occurring today, Darwinists run to mind-boggling eons of time in the past. If it is demonstrated that blind processes cannot create, Darwinists protest that the processes are not really blind. If it is demonstrated that natural selection cannot account for the formation of new organs and creatures, Darwinists run to genetic mutations. If it is demonstrated that mutations are

not creative mechanisms, Darwinists run to the mysteries of unknown genetic processes. If it is demonstrated that the fossil record does not display constant change, Darwinists run to hopeful monsters and punctuated equilibrium. If it is demonstrated that no naturalistic process can explain the origin of life, Darwinists run to extra-terrestrials and to multiverses.

Because of this, refuting evolution can be like trying to nail Jell-O to a wall.

Even some evolutionists have complained that Darwinism cannot be “falsified.”

22. Science is extremely fallible and has erred countless times.

Juan Arsuaga candidly advises,

“... those seeking absolute truth or an immutable and unassailable dogma should look in a field other than science” (*Neanderthal's Necklace*, p. 17).

This is true, because science is so incredibly fallible. Consider the case of Ignaz Philipp Semmelweis:

“On July 1, 1818, a little boy was born in Budapest, Hungary. His mother named him Ignaz. As the boy grew, so did his interest in medicine and the sciences. Eventually, he became a doctor. In his work at the Vienna General Hospital, Ignaz saw many victims of the highly contagious and often deadly puerperal fever. Slowly he began to suspect an increased risk for anyone having contact with fever victims. In time his tentative suspicions became firm convictions. Reasoning that physicians in the hospital were somehow carrying the disease from the autopsy room and transmitting it to women in the maternity ward, Ignaz ordered all of the physicians in his service to wash their hands thoroughly in a solution of chlorinated lime before examining patients. This was a radical and controversial move, and it resulted in big trouble for the young doctor.

“Keep in mind that Ignaz took this stand years before Louis Pasteur, with his microscope, ever scientifically documented the danger of infectious bacteria. To say the least, at the time in which Ignaz lived, such a radical position was just not politically-scientifically correct. As a result, great pressure was brought to bear on the young man. He was ridiculed, hounded, and even viciously attacked. His character was smeared mercilessly. ‘Crazy old Ignaz’ was the growing sentiment of young and old that seemed to follow him everywhere he went. Yet he stood his ground, entirely alone--one man against the entire scientific establishment of his day. No one--absolutely no one--agreed with him. He was universally regarded as a nut.

“In the end, although he never gave ground scientifically, the incredible, relentless, pressure got to him. Ignaz lapsed into insanity. His death followed on August 1, 1865. At the age of 47, Ignaz Philipp Semmelweis was just as right as he could be, though the entire world and all of the scientific experts thought otherwise. Shortly thereafter, Joseph Lister performed his first antiseptic operation and Semmelweis, dead less than a year, was on his way to a full vindication” (“When Science Errs: The Oft Times Lonely Stand for Truth,” <http://aiaa.christiananswers.net/resources/thoughtletters/27/>).

A recent example of how science has erred is the so-called junk DNA. The term, which was introduced in 1972 by Susumu Ohno, refers to the alleged “non-coding” part of DNA “consisted of randomly-produced sequences that had lost their coding ability or partially duplicated genes that were non-functional.” Evolutionists argued that God would not make “flawed” DNA.

A 1980 article by Leslie Orgel and Francis Crick said non-coding DNA “has little specificity and conveys little or no selective advantage to the organism.” Junk DNA as an evolutionary “vestigial” was argued by Darrel Falk in *Coming to Peace with Science*.

It turns out that “junk” DNA isn’t junk, and any creationist could have predicted that this is the case.

Gretchen Vogel said, “The term ‘junk DNA’ is a reflection of our ignorance” (“Why Sequence the Junk?” *Science*, Vol. 291, Feb. 16, 2001, p. 1184).

John Mattick observed, “The failure to recognize the importance of introns [so-called junk DNA] may well go down as one of the biggest mistakes in the history of molecular biology” (quote by W. Wayt Gibbs, “The Unseen Genome,” *Scientific American*, Vol. 289, Nov. 2003, pp. 49-50).

23. We must be careful in using quotes.

Having gone to much effort to confirm quotes, to trace them to original sources, and to examine them in context, I have found that some popular quotes on the creation-evolution debate are taken out of context and some are actually bogus. For example, the following widely-used quote is a fabrication:

“There are only two possible explanations as to how life arose: Spontaneous generation arising to evolution or a supernatural creative act of God. ... There is no other possibility. Spontaneous generation was scientifically disproved 120 years ago by Louis Pasteur and others, but that just leaves us with only one other possibility ... that life came as a supernatural act of creation by God, but I can’t accept that philosophy because I do not want to believe in God. Therefore I choose to believe in that which I know is scientifically impossible; spontaneous generation leading to evolution” (George Wald, “The Origin of Life,” *Scientific American*, August 1954, cited from White and Comninellis, *Darwin’s Demise*, p 46).

This quote has been repeated often in creationist literature to demonstrate that atheistic evolutionists are committed to their position even though they know it is impossible. Actually, the quote as commonly given is someone’s paraphrase of what Wald wrote, and it does not accurately

reflect what he said or what he believed. He was saying that something that might *appear* impossible today is not impossible given billions of years. He didn't even write the words, "I choose to believe in that which I know is scientifically impossible; spontaneous generation leading to evolution." Someone apparently made this up. It could have even been invented by an evolutionist seeking to make fun of creationists, and if so, it has been successful.

Everyone makes mistakes and no one can check every quote, but we must be as careful as possible in our research. Fundamentalist preachers are notoriously guilty of passing along inaccurate quotes. I learned early on in my Christian life to double check things as much as possible. With the Internet, this is easier to do today than ever before.

24. God's people have to be willing to bear Christ's reproach in this present world.

"Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels" (Mark 8:38).

"... if we deny him, he also will deny us" (2 Timothy 2:12).

I recall how embarrassing it was for me as a kid when I was in public school that someone might think I was a Christian. I would not have dreamed of carrying a Bible for this very reason. There were a few godly believers who really stood out and let their light shine, but I had nothing to do with them in order to be accepted by the crowd. At that time in my life I loved the acclaim of the world more than Christ.

Walt Brown, who has a Ph.D. from MIT, came to a creationist position in his 30s. In looking back on his youth he explains one of the reasons why he didn't look into the issue earlier:

"Those who accepted the biblical version of creation and a global flood were a little embarrassing to be around. I

became a Christian in high school, but held the above attitudes until my early 30s” (*In the Beginning*, p. 316).

I think that the desire to be one of the crowd, to be in the majority, is one of the greatest reasons why people don’t submit to the truth. In fact, they don’t even want to examine it. This is not a small thing. Fear of man probably sends more people to Hell than any other one thing.

“But THE FEARFUL, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death” (Revelation 21:8).

25. Evolution is not universally believed.

Apologists for evolution give the impression that most people reject evolution today, but the fact is that the majority of people in America, at least, reject the naturalistic philosophy.

According to a 2010 Gallup poll, 40 percent of Americans believe in biblical creationism and 38 percent believe in theistic evolution (“Poll,” *The Christian Post*, Dec. 19, 2010). Only 16 percent believe in the view that humans evolved over millions of years without God’s involvement. The percentage is almost the same for college graduates, and even among postgraduates only 25 percent believe in naturalistic evolution.

26. The foundational issue is God Himself and a personal relationship with Him through Christ.

We must not forget that the foundational issue in apologetics is to introduce men and women to God through Christ.

If you believe in the Almighty God of Scripture, it is a simple matter to accept what the Bible says, whether it is a six-day creation or Christ’s virgin birth, bodily resurrection and Second Coming, or anything else. The fact is that these

are things that pertain to the supernatural and they cannot be tested by natural science.

D.B. Gower, Ph.D. in biochemistry and D.Sc. from the University of London, writes:

“It was about this time, in the mid-1960s, that my ideas of the greatness of God were transformed. No longer was He a ‘pocket’ God who did things as I could imagine from my ‘human viewpoint,’ but He had staggeringly great power, far beyond anything I could possibly comprehend. If God is so great, then there is nothing He could not do” (*In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, p. 266).

This hits the nail on the head. The problem with people who can’t believe in the miracles of the Bible is that they believe either in no God or a “pocket” God. When you believe in the Almighty God revealed in Scripture, it is easy to believe that the world was made in six days. In fact, it is easy to believe that it was made in six micro-seconds, if the Bible said so.

Dr. Robert Dick Wilson, one of the greatest biblical scholars of the 20th century, proficient in dozens of ancient languages, divided men into two categories: big-godders and little-godders, and that pretty much sums it up.

“One of the students of Princeton Theological Seminary professor Robert Dick Wilson had been invited to preach in Miller Chapel 12 years after his graduation. Dr. Wilson came and sat near the front. When chapel ended, the old professor came up to his former student, cocked his head to one side in his characteristic way, extended his hand, and said, ‘I’m glad that you’re a big-godder. When my boys come back, I come to see if they’re big-godders or little-godders. Then I know what their ministry will be.’

“His former student asked him to explain. Wilson replied, ‘Well, some men have a little God, and they’re always in trouble with Him. He can’t do any miracles. He can’t take care of the inspiration and transmission of the Scripture to us. He doesn’t intervene on behalf of His people. Then,

there are those who have a great God. He speaks and it is done. He commands and it stands fast. He knows how to show Himself strong on behalf of them that fear Him. You have a great God; and He'll bless your ministry” (John Huffman, *Who's in Charge Here?*).

The Christian apologist's objective is to make “big-godders” of people.

This comes through knowing God personally by faith in Jesus Christ. We are separated from God by our sin, both inherited and personal, and Christ died to pay the price God's Law demands so that we can be reconciled to Him. When a sinner repents of his sin and puts his faith in Jesus Christ as only Lord and Saviour, a dramatic change occurs. He is born again and receives the indwelling Holy Spirit as his Teacher. His thinking is changed. This happened to me in 1973 when I was 23 years old. Before that I was antagonistic toward the Bible. I doubted the Bible's teaching on things such as judgment, salvation, and the future, but those doubts were resolved by my new relationship with God in Christ.

Christ instructed us to be witnesses of Him (Acts 1:8). We must inform people of who He is and why He came to earth. Apologetics can remove barriers that have keep people from considering Christ, but our goal is not to win arguments about evidences; our goal is to introduce people to Christ.

Canals on Mars

“One can’t believe impossible things,” Alice said.
The Red Queen replied, “I dare say you haven’t had much practice.
When I was your age, I always did it for half an hour a day. Why,
sometimes I’ve believed as many as six impossible things before
breakfast.” - *Alice in Wonderland*

One of the most interesting examples of how a man can see what he wants to see, how a man’s will affects his mind and vision, is the case of Percival Lowell (1865-1916).

He was born into a wealthy, high-society Boston family, graduated from Harvard, was a brilliant mathematician and successful businessman, traveled widely in the Far East, learned several languages, and kept company with affluent, influential people.

Charles Darwin’s *On the Origin of Species* was published when Lowell was a boy, and he accepted the doctrine of evolution wholeheartedly.

Later Lowell’s imagination was stirred by Italian astronomer Giovanni Schiaparelli’s 1893 book *Life on Mars* and the report of supposed “channels” on the red planet. Seeing this as proof that life existed on other planets Lowell set out to bring this “evidence” home for the evolutionary cause. He used his wealth to construct an astronomical observatory with a 24-inch telescope in the American west near the Grand Canyon. It was completed in 1894, and from then until his death 22 years later he studied Mars and published reports and books.

Eventually he “saw” and named 700 canals on Mars and came to believe that Martians were building the canals in an attempt to save their planet. He even deduced many fascinating details about the lives of the Martian aliens.

Buried near his telescope, Lowell left his wealth for “the study of our Solar System and its evolution.”

The one small problem with all of this is that there are no canals on Mars and there are no Martians. In the 1970s the NASA Viking space vehicles orbited Mars and actually landed and roamed around on it, hunting for life, and found no evidence of canals or Martians.

How could an intelligent, well-educated man see canals and alien civilizations that do not exist? The answer is that he saw what he wanted to see. It is the same phenomenon that allows any evolutionary atheist to see evidence for Darwinian evolution when none exists. The Bible explains it as the deceit of the fallen human heart and willful spiritual blindness.

It is possible to believe a lie and to believe it with all of one's heart. I am so thankful to the Lord for opening my blind eyes nearly 40 years ago and showing me the truth in Jesus Christ.

“The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?” (Jeremiah 17:9).

“In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them” (2 Corinthians 4:4).

Charles Darwin and His Granddaddy

“Our ancestor was an animal which breathed water, had a swim bladder, a great swimming tail, an imperfect skull, and undoubtedly was an hermaphrodite”
(Charles Darwin).

Charles Darwin (1809-1882) is the most prominent name in the field of evolution. Kimball’s high school biology textbook (1965) said that his *On the Origin of Species* “ranks second only to the Holy Bible in its impact on man’s thinking.” Darwin’s most popular books are considered pivotal in popularizing of the evolutionary myth. These are *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* (1859) and *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex* (1871).

An Environment of Skepticism

As one biographer says, there was a “vein of skepticism in the Darwin family” (John Wehler, *Charles Darwin: Growing up in Shrewsbury*).

Charles’ paternal grandfather, **ERASMUS DARWIN** (1731-1802), was a materialist who denied the soul of man and taught that “all mental states derive from the motion of particles in the brain.” He “discarded the Bible and Jesus” and “adored in the Temple of Nature; for him Reason was divine, and Progress its prophet” (Adrian Desmond, *Darwin*, pp. 5, 9).

Erasmus was a tremendously influential man, a pioneering medical doctor, poet, philosopher, naturalist, and inventor. He “was generally regarded as the leading English poet of the time” (Desmond King-Hele, *Erasmus Darwin*, p. 264). Nora Barlow says, “Today it is difficult to realise the immense

vogue Erasmus Darwin's works once possessed" (*The Autobiography of Charles Darwin* edited by Barlow, p. 150). He invented a speaking machine, a copying machine, and the steering mechanism used in modern cars. His close friends consisted of men such as Benjamin Franklin, one of America's founding fathers; John Michell, the father of seismology; John Whitehurst, inventor of the factory time clock; John Baskerville, famous printer and type font designer; James Watt, perfecter of the steam engine; and James Brindley, creator of England's canal system. Erasmus was a Fellow of the Royal Society, the first in a line of six generations of Darwins to be so honored. In science, Erasmus was ahead of his time, having a basic understanding of such things as oxygen, cloud formation, oxygenation of the blood, and photosynthesis.

Erasmus' first wife, Polly, the mother of Charles Darwin's father, Robert, was non-religious in a religious age, and she "faced death calmly without supernatural assistance" (King-Hele, p. 94).

Erasmus was a moral scoundrel who was "fond of sacrificing to both Bacchus and Venus" (p. 18), meaning he loved alcohol and women. Though he gave up drinking for his health's sake, he continued to sacrifice to Venus throughout his life. After the death of Polly, Erasmus bore two daughters out of wedlock with his live-in governess, who was 22 years his junior. He also composed lush erotic verse" (Desmond, p. 6).

Erasmus' god was a First Cause that had some vague part in bringing life into existence but had no role in men's lives. Rejecting the true and living God, Erasmus worshipped "a distant Deity ... the vast Unknown." By his student years at Cambridge, he had rejected the biblical view of God. At age 23 he referred to God as a Being who had no role in the affairs of men (King-Hele, p. 17). At Cambridge, he was deeply influenced to Deism by Albert Reimarus, the son of German philosopher Hermann Reimarus. At age 37 Erasmus

wrote to Albert and said that he was continuing “in the Religion you taught us.”

In the second volume of *Zoonomia*, Erasmus identified religion and hell as psychological diseases.

One of these supposed psychic afflictions was “*spes religiosa*” or “superstitious hope.” He called this a “maniacal hallucination,” an insanity that has produced “cruelties, murders, massacres” into the world. Thus, Erasmus Darwin, the God hater who did not distinguish false religion from true, predated the so-called “new atheists” like Richard Dawkins by more than two centuries.

Another alleged psychological disease that Erasmus identified was “*orci timor*” or “the fear of hell.” He wrote, “Many theatric preachers among the Methodists successfully inspire this terror, and live comfortably upon the folly of their hearers” (*Zoonomia*, Vol. 2, p 379). Erasmus implied that all preachers of hell are hypocrites who preach for money, which is patently false. Jesus Christ preached about hell, for the very reason that hell is a reality and He came to earth to save men from the punishment that they deserve. Jesus certainly didn’t live comfortably. His payment for speaking the truth in love was rejection, mocking, and the cross. The only payment Jesus’ disciples received for warning men to flee hell through faith in Christ was persecution and death. The same has been true for countless other Bible preachers in the two millennia since. The founders of Methodism did not preach for money; they were hounded and persecuted by the established church. Erasmus Darwin was a slanderer of Bible preachers.

After his death, an obituary in the *Monthly Magazine* stated that Erasmus told a friend “let us not hear anything about hell.”

Erasmus said that religious people are credulous dupes and that religious credulity can be cured by “knowledge of the laws of nature.”

Erasmus believed in the evolution of life from an original microscopic biological speck to man.

His family coat of arms featured three scallop shells with the motto *E conchis omnia* or “everything from shells,” referring to his belief in the evolution of life from the sea.

(Charles Darwin kept the shells on the seal and even added four more, but he changed the motto to *cave et aude* or “beware and dare.”)

Erasmus was influenced by his friend James Hutton’s view of long geological ages and uniformitarianism (King-Hele, p. 245). Without this doctrine, the myth of evolution would not be possible.

Erasmus preached his doctrine of evolution in a popular two-volume set of books entitled *Zoonomia; or, the Laws of Organic Life* (1794-96). The books went through many editions in England and America, with translations into German, Italian, French, and Portuguese.

Zoonomia promotes the very concepts later popularized by Charles Darwin: natural selection, survival of the fittest, sexual selection, homology, and vestigial organs.

Erasmus believed that everything has risen from an original “living filament” which was formed by “spontaneous vitality” in “the primeval ocean.” He wrote:

“Would it be too bold to imagine, that in the great length of time since the earth began to exist, perhaps millions of ages before the commencement of the history of mankind, would it be too bold to imagine, that all warm-blooded animals have arisen from one living filament, which THE GREAT FIRST CAUSE endued with animality, with the power of acquiring new parts, attended with new propensities, directed by irritations, sensations, volitions, and associations; and thus possessing the faculty of continuing to improve by its own inherent activity, and of delivering down those improvements by generation to its posterity, world without end!” (*Zoonomia*, Vol. 2, p. 240).

Erasmus Darwin’s book *The Temple of Nature* was published the year after his death. It presents the doctrine of

evolution under the guise of lessons he supposedly learned from the goddess Urania, Priestess of Nature.

Ere Time began, from flaming Chaos hurl'd
Rose the bright spheres, which form the circling world ...
Nurs'd by warm sun-beams in primeval caves,
Organic Life began beneath the waves. ...
Hence without parent by spontaneous birth
Rise the first specks of animated earth;
From Nature's womb the plant or insect swims,
And buds or breathes, with microscopic limbs. ...
New powers acquire, and larger limbs assume;
Whence countless groups of vegetation spring,
And breathing realms of fin, and feet, and wing.

Erasmus Darwin borrowed from ancient paganism. Darwin thought of himself as a free thinker, but his religion was nothing more than ancient Babylonian goddess-earth worship. In fact, it goes farther back than this, to the Devil's lie to Eve, "Ye shall be as gods" (Genesis 3:5).

Erasmus' skepticism was so radical that it even shocked the Unitarian transcendentalist Samuel Taylor Coleridge, who called him "an Atheist." Coleridge described Erasmus' doctrine as "the Orang Outang theology of the human race" ("Charles Darwin and His Grandfather," *The Autobiography of Charles Darwin* edited by Nora Barlow, p. 151).

For his part, Erasmus called Unitarianism a featherbed to catch a falling Christian. Unitarianism had begun a centuries earlier as a denial of the Trinity, "but by Darwin's time it had become the church for the smart-set, who were smugly certain that the Bible was merely one more book of ancient mythology" (Wiker, *The Darwin Myth*, p. 16).

Erasmus was a close associate of Unitarian Christ-denier Joseph Priestley (though Priestly condemned Darwin's evolutionary thinking), the French Deist Voltaire, and other skeptics who rejected divine Revelation.

One of Erasmus' closest friends was the Unitarian Josiah Wedgwood, the grandfather of Charles Darwin's wife. Wedgwood was a disciple of Priestly, who preached in Birmingham until he was driven out in 1791 by a mob opposed to his religious skepticism and radical socialistic politics. Josiah's famous Wedgwood pottery firm even honored Priestly with a medallion featuring his likeness.

The two grandfathers bequeathed "a mixture of freethought and radical Christianity to their grandchildren" (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 5).

Erasmus died seven years before Charles' birth, but the grandson read *Zoonomia* twice in his youth (*The Autobiography of Charles Darwin*, p. 49).

"Belief in evolution, passed on to his son Robert and reincarnated in his grandson Charles, can be seen as the finest of Erasmus's legacies" (Desmond King-Hele, p. 363).

Charles' mother, Susannah, was a Unitarian. Her father Josiah Wedgwood, as we have seen, was a prominent Unitarian and a personal friend of Erasmus Darwin. Susannah attended High Street Chapel in Shrewsbury, which had begun to be infected with unbelief in the 18th century under the pastorate of Job Orton. That Orton did not hold to the full Godhead of Jesus Christ is evident by his comment on the name "The mighty God" in Isaiah 9:6. He said, "The meaning of this I cannot tell." High Street had become a full-blown Unitarian congregation during the pastorate of George Case (1797-1831). Susannah was educated at the feet of a Unitarian teacher hired by her father. Charles was educated for a short time at a school operated by Case. Today the church is called Shrewsbury Unitarian Church, High Street, and a plaque inside the building says: "To the memory of Charles Robert Darwin, author of 'The Origin Of Species,' born in Shrewsbury, February 12, 1809, in early life a member of and a constant worshipper in this church."

Charles' father, Robert, was also a skeptic. Robert was educated by Unitarians in the same school attended by

Susannah. He was even “less orthodox in his faith than Erasmus” (Himmelfarb, *Darwin and the Darwinian Evolution*, p. 11). Ian Taylor says Robert’s “disbelief extended to the borders of atheism” (*In the Minds of Men*, p. 113). He adopted Erasmus’ motto *E Conchis Omnia* (“all things out of shells”) as his own and displayed it on his bookplate. Erasmus’ Darwin’s biographer says that Robert “never abandoned his belief in evolution and that he deserves much credit for bringing up Charles in an evolution-friendly atmosphere. ... Robert greatly helped Charles to bring himself to believe in evolution in defiance of orthodox scientific thinking” (Desmond King-Hele, p. 359).

Robert was not brave, though, and hid his skepticism behind a public mask of Anglican respectability. (Charles inherited his father’s reticence about being forthright in his religious skepticism and largely left it to others, such as Thomas Huxley, to fight publicly for what he believed.) At home, though, Robert Darwin was master and he had no qualms in stating his unbelief and disallowing other opinions. Ian Taylor observes, “Doctor Darwin’s authority in the Darwin family was patriarchal, at six feet two inches and 328 pounds; when he was present, every conversation had to be exactly pleasing to the master’s ear; under these conditions, it is extremely unlikely that there would have been any ‘Bible-talk’ in the Darwin home” (*In the Minds of Men*, p. 113).

Darwin’s elder brother Erasmus, named after their famous grandfather, was a radical skeptic in his own right. Charles loved to spend time there, where “the buzz was radical and Dissenting and ‘heterodoxy was the norm’” (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 216). This crowd, which was deeply influenced by German biblical criticism and its accompanying theological modernism, “gave Charles the license to work out his own deterministic theories.” Erasmus’ intimate lady friend, the Unitarian Harriet Martineau, did not believe in miracles. She was the translator of the atheist Auguste Comte’s pantheistic *Positive Philosophy* into English

(Adrian Desmond, *Huxley*, p. 187). Comte's objective was to replace the religion of God with "the religion of humanity." Charles loved Comte, calling *Positive Philosophy* "capital" (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 260), and he "was intrigued by Martineau's message, that Christian beliefs about reward and punishment were based on heathen superstitions" (p. 362). Later she repaid the compliment, calling *On the Origin of Species* "one of the most important books of this century" and foreseeing that it was "likely to effect an immense mental revolution" (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 486). (By 1874, Charles' "liberated" crowd was participating in seances to communicate with the dead, Desmond, p. 607).

Darwin at Edinburgh

Charles' father wanted him to be a doctor and sent him to Edinburgh University for that purpose. There he cast his lot with the most radical, skeptical crowd. He was elected to the Plinian Society in 1826, at a time when "it had been penetrated by radical students--fiery, freethinking democrats who demanded that science be based on physical causes, not supernatural forces" (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 31). Darwin was invited for the very reason that his grandfather Erasmus was a skeptical evolutionist. Darwin's membership was sponsored by William Browne, who "had no time for souls and saints." Browne hated the Bible and the doctrine of creation, and when Charles Bell proposed that the human face reflects man's moral nature and is an evidence of divine creation, Browne opposed him. Brown stirred up a great controversy when he lectured that "mind and consciousness are not spiritual entities, separate from the body; they are simple spinoffs from the brain activity" (Howard Gruber, *Darwin on Man*, p. 479). The other student inducted into the Plinian Society with Darwin was the Unitarian-educated William Greg, who was "just as heretical as Browne" and hated creationism.

Darwin's closest friend at Edinburgh was professor Robert Edmond Grant, another member of the Plinian society. He

was “an uncompromising evolutionist” who believed that “the origin and evolution of life were due simply to physical and chemical forces, all obeying natural laws” (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 34). A man for whom “nothing was sacred,” he was “savagely anti-Christian” (p. 40). Grant loved Erasmus Darwin’s *Zoonomia*. He believed in spontaneous generation of life from “monads” or “elementary living particles” and held that the sponge is the parent of higher animals.

“When Charles was supposed to be working hard at his medical studies, he was instead working diligently under Grant for several months like a devoted disciple as he pursued his research on polyps ... The goal of this research was directly tied to Grant’s desire to demonstrate that transmutationism was correct. ... It was Grant who first taught Darwin to look at the details of nature through Erasmus Darwin’s eager eyes. Though Darwin had already studied his grandfather’s *Zoonomia* and read the French evolutionist Lamarck, including his well-known lecture on species transmutation, it was Grant who brought it to life and it was Grant who showed Darwin what transmutationist research should look like. Erasmus Darwin had provided the speculative framework (including ideas that Charles would make famous, such as common descent with modification, sexual selection, the survival of the fittest); it was transmutationist research that could provide the evidence” (Benjamin Wiker, *The Darwin Myth*, pp. 12, 13).

Darwin also attended Robert Jameson’s lectures at Edinburgh entitled “Origin of Species of Animals,” promoting the idea that the higher animals evolved from the “simplest worms.” Jameson, “wild-haired Regis Professor of Natural History,” was the founder of the Plinian Society.

Darwin at Cambridge

Not being able to stomach the blood and guts aspect of the medical field (at a time when operations were conducted without anesthesia), Darwin sought his father’s counsel and

was advised to study for the Anglican ministry at Cambridge. Neither man believed the Bible or the Gospel of Christ, but that was not necessary for an Anglican rector in that day. “The Anglican Church, fat, complacent, and corrupt, lived luxuriously on its tithes and endowments, as it had for a century. Desirable parishes were routinely auctioned to the highest bidder” (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 47). If Darwin obtained a country rectory he could live the leisurely and respected life of a gentleman.

At Cambridge Darwin had opposing influences.

On one hand he had associations that defended the traditional Anglican faith. This was probably the first time he was actually confronted with any sort of defense of the Christian faith. He developed a friendship with John Henslow, a botany professor who was “so orthodox, that he told me one day, he should be grieved if a single word of the Thirty-nine Articles were altered” (*Autobiography*, pp. 64, 65). He was also impressed with John Sumner’s *Evidences of Christianity*, which “made sceptics look silly” (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 49).

In fact, Darwin claimed that at this point in his life he fully accepted the Anglican creed, and much has been made of this by some biographers, but he didn’t take the creed literally. He was convinced that he could “accept” the Thirty-Nine Articles *without maintaining “actual belief of each and every separate proposition contained in them”* (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 86). At no point in his life did Charles Darwin believe the Bible!

Darwin “was unconcerned about his soul” (p. 57) and made no personal commitment to Jesus Christ.

He continued to resonate with the skepticism that was spreading within the Church of England. One of those voices was **William Paley**, whose books *Evidences of Christianity* and *Moral and Political Philosophy* were required reading for the Cambridge B.A. His “watchmaker” argument is famous. (If you find a watch lying in the woods, you would assume it was made by an intelligent being; likewise, the design of

creation points to an intelligent creator.) Many biographers have noted that Darwin enjoyed Paley's writings, implying that this was a strong Christian influence, but this is not the case. Paley argued merely for the existence of God through natural revelation. Paley, a senior Anglican clergyman, did not believe that the Bible is divinely inspired. Paley's God was "Aristotle's God--a master designer but now remote from his creation"; he "tended to leave God 'out there' remote from his creation" (Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, pp. 115, 349). Paley wrote an anonymous publication protesting the necessity of Cambridge lecturers subscribing to the Church of England's thirty-nine articles of faith.

Darwin was also influenced by Jean Baptiste de Monet de Lamarck's *Philosophie Zoologique* (1809), which was a challenge to creationism. Lamarck's false idea of acquired attributes was largely accepted by Darwin and later promoted in his writings. Lamarck taught, for example, that the giraffe's neck became elongated when giraffes stretched their necks to reach leaves higher in the trees and the resulting elongation was passed on to subsequent generations.

When the atheistic radicals Richard Carlile and Robert Taylor visited Cambridge to whip up anti-Christian passions," Darwin was one of the students identified as sympathetic to their agenda (though unwilling to pay the price of coming out publicly with his agnosticism). Carlile and Taylor distributed a circular announcing themselves as "Infidel missionaries" and proclaiming their (ridiculous) faith "that such a person as Jesus Christ, alleged to have been of Nazareth, never existed" (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 71). They were driven away from Cambridge and Taylor was castigated as "the Devil's Chaplain." Darwin later recalled this and feared being similarly branded.

Darwin's Journey on the Beagle

In 1831, Darwin began his famous five year journey on the *H.M.S. Beagle*. There, too, he was confronted with two

diametrically opposing views. The captain, Robert Fitz-Roy, believed the Bible and personally conducted the mandatory Sunday services. Ironically, one of Fitz-Roy's objectives (beyond the official one of mapping coast lines for the British navy) was to substantiate the book of Genesis. In his journal, FitzRoy said that geology rightly understood is compatible with the Genesis Flood.

Darwin was more heavily influenced during the voyage by reading the *Principles of Geology* by **Charles Lyell**, which he "studied attentively" (*Autobiography*, p. 77). Lyell's uniformitarianism was a bold and brash denial of the Bible's teaching of divine Creation and the universal Flood, and this was his express objective. Darwin described Lyell as "thoroughly liberal in his religious beliefs or rather disbeliefs" (*Autobiography*, p. 100). Lyell was a personal friend and supporter of John William Colenso, the Anglican Bishop of Natal, who likened the Pentateuch to the mythical accounts of King Arthur's Court (Di Gregorio, *From Here to Eternity*, p. 240). But Lyell was more subtle. He abstained from attacking the Bible publicly only so as to undermine it covertly, which he considered more effective. Darwin said, "Lyell is most firmly convinced that he has shaken the faith in the Deluge far more efficiently by never having said a word against the Bible than if he had acted otherwise" (Himmelfarb, *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution*, p. 387). In other words, he was a "wolf in sheep's clothing." In a letter to a friend in 1827, Lyell even likened biblical Christianity to an idol (Himmelfarb, p. 193).

Darwin claims that he was "quite orthodox" during the Beagle journey, but he was grossly abusing the term "orthodox." Note the full quotation from his *Autobiography*:

"Whilst on board the Beagle I was quite orthodox ... But I had gradually come, by this time, to see that the Old Testament from its manifestly false history of the world, with the Tower of Babel, the rainbow as a sign, etc., etc., and from its attributing to God the feelings of

a revengeful tyrant, was no more to be trusted than the sacred books of the Hindoos, or the beliefs of any barbarian. ... By further reflecting that the clearest evidence would be requisite to make any sane man believe in the miracles by which Christianity is supported,--that **the more we know of the fixed laws of nature the more incredible do miracles become,**--that the men at that time were ignorant and credulous to a degree almost incomprehensible by us,--that the Gospels cannot be proved to have been written simultaneously with the events ... by such reflections as these, which I give not as having the least novelty or value, but as they influenced me, I gradually came to disbelieve in Christianity as a divine revelation” (*Autobiography*, pp. 85, 86).

Again, it is obvious that Darwin did not believe the Bible at any point in his life.

He did still believe in God and the human soul, though, and was still moved by the sight of God’s amazing creation.

“Formerly I was led by feelings such as those just referred to ... to the firm conviction of the existence of God, and of the immortality of the soul. In my Journal I wrote that whilst standing in the midst of the grandeur of a Brazilian forest, ‘it is not possible to give an adequate idea of the higher feelings of wonder, admiration, and devotion which fill and elevate the mind.’ I well remember my conviction that there is more in man than the mere breath of his body” (*Autobiography*, p. 91).

Instead of pursuing these convictions and seeking God in Jesus Christ and finding out if there were answers to his skeptical questions about the Bible, Darwin allowed unbelief to win his heart. He wasn’t interested in finding answers to skeptical challenges. The aforementioned arguments against the Bible were actually flimsy excuses to prop up his willful unbelief.

As soon Darwin returned from his journey, Lyell invited him to his house and they developed a life-long friendship.

Darwin said, "I saw more of Lyell than of any other man both before and after my marriage" (*Autobiography*, p. 100). Darwin later said, "The science of Geology is enormously indebted to Lyell--more so, as I believe, than to any other man who ever lived" (p. 101). Lyell was one of the men who urged Darwin to write *On the Origin of Species* (p. 122).

By 1836, Charles' skepticism was complete, by his own admission. He had concluded that the Bible's miracles were not credible to any "sane man" (*Autobiography*, p. 86).

In his private notebooks dating to 1836-1844, Darwin considered man's thoughts in a purely materialistic manner. He said thought "seems as much function of organ, as bile of liver," and there is no "soul superadded" (Paul Barrett, *Charles Darwin's Notebooks*, p. 613, 614).

Like his grandfather Erasmus, Charles Darwin especially hated the doctrine of eternal torment.

"Thus disbelief crept over me at a very slow rate, but was at last complete. The rate was so slow that I felt no distress, and have never since doubted even for a single second that my conclusion was correct. I can indeed hardly see how anyone ought to wish Christianity to be true; for if so the plain language of the text seems to show that the men who do not believe, and this would include my Father, Brother, and almost all my best friends, will be everlastingly punished. And this is a damnable doctrine" (*Autobiography*, p. 87).

Thus Darwin admitted that his father and brother and closest friends were all skeptics who rejected the Bible.

Darwin claimed that he was still a Theist of some sort when he wrote *On the Origin of Species*, but that "since that time it has very gradually with many fluctuations become weaker" (*Autobiography*, p. 93). Eventually he adopted Thomas Huxley's term "agnostic" (p. 94).

In 1871, Darwin put his stamp of approval on *The Index*, the weekly publication of the very radical Free Religious Association. The publication was dedicated to "the spirit of

reform” without “deference to the authority of the Bible, the Church, or the Christ.” The editor, Francis Abbot, was the author of *Truths for the Times* which boldly opposed the Bible and Christianity. Darwin said, “I have now read *Truths for the Times*, and I admire them from my inmost heart; and I believe that I agree to every word.” Later he had Abbot change that to “I agree to almost every word,” but he added, “The points on which I doubtfully differ are unimportant.” (Abbot committed suicide at his wife’s grave in 1903.)

In spite of his growing boldness in unbelief, Darwin continued to fear. After the publication of *On the Origin of Species*, he described a nagging fear that “I ... have devoted my life to a phantasy” (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 477).

Darwin’s Wife

Darwin’s wife, Emma, was a Unitarian-influenced Anglican. Trained at the feet of Unitarians hired by her skeptic father, the son of Josiah Wedgwood, she retained a love for Anglican ritual and even a vague belief in Christ’s atonement, though not in the Bible as the infallible Word of God. Though she continued to attend Anglican churches all her life, she refused to face the altar because she rejected the Trinity (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 403).

She was deeply worried about Charles’ lack of faith and “implored him to be ‘careful, perhaps even fearful’ of ‘casting off’ what Jesus had ‘done for your benefit as well as for that of all the world’” (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 281). This brought Charles to tears, but he hardened his heart to her pleas.

The problem is that when you reject the Bible as the infallible Word of God and pick and choose what you believe in its pages, you destroy the foundation of the gospel and are just as much an unbeliever as the most raging “agnostic.” It is impossible to “believe in Jesus” and deny that He is God (as Unitarians like Emma did), because He plainly stated this truth and accepted worship as God. It is impossible to

“believe in Jesus” and reject the complete historicity and infallible inspiration of the book of Genesis because Jesus put His imprimatur on it. And it is impossible to believe in Jesus while disbelieving that Jonah was swallowed by a whale, because Jesus said it happened. To believe in Jesus while disbelieving some other part of the Bible is to believe in a false christ.

Not surprisingly, Emma’s faith weakened throughout their marriage. By 1874, she joined Charles’ brother Erasmus in dabbling in spiritism and was open to the possibility of communication with the dead (Desmond, *Darwin*, pp. 607, 608).

Darwin’s Strange Illness and Mental Torment

In rejecting God and promoting life as a product of blind evolution, Darwin was sinning against his own conscience and he suffered greatly for it. He was afraid of being branded “the Devil’s chaplain.” He was “destitute of faith, yet terrified at scepticism” (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 268). “When Darwin did come out of his closet and bare his soul to a friend, he used a telling expression. He said it was ‘like confessing a murder’” (Desmond, p. xviii).

The full title to Adrian Desmond’s biography is *Darwin: The Life of a Tormented Evolutionist*.

“He cut himself off, ducked parties and declined engagements; he even installed a mirror outside his study window to spy on visitors as they came up his drive. ... for years after reaching his rural retreat he refused to sleep anywhere else, unless it was a safe house, a close relative’s home. This was a worried man. ... He was living a double life with double standards, unable to broach his species work with anyone except Erasmus, for fear he be branded irresponsible, irreligious, or worse. It began to tell in the pit of his stomach” (pp. xix, 233).

Darwin suffered much of his life from debilitating sickness, so much so that he was largely a recluse and invalid during

his the last 30 years of his life. Even in 1841, nearly 20 years before he published *On the Origin of Species*, he described himself as “a dull old spiritless dog” who only rarely had visitors (Desmond, p. 291). His sickness took the form of stomach problems, heart palpitations, vomiting, and eczema. “... a third of his working life was spent doubled up, trembling, vomiting, and dowsing himself in icy water” (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. xviii).

The Huxleys described Darwin’s house as “an infirmary where no one got well; here illness was the norm and health a strange affliction ... a strange sanatorium, where the family turned up like guests for their evening meal” (Desmond, *Huxley*, p. 291).

Before the publication of *On the Origin of Species*, Darwin had “uncomfortable palpitation of the heart” and a “terrible long fit of vomiting,” and upon the first sight of the book “one leg swelled like elephantiasis--eyes almost closed up--covered with a rash and fiery boils” (Desmond, *Huxley*, p. 257, *Darwin*, p. 233). He hid out for the next two months at a hydropathic spa, “living in Hell,” waiting for the furor to die down.

The following description of Darwin’s condition in 1848 was typical:

“Waves of dizziness and despondency swept over him. Through the winter he suffered dreadful vomiting fits every week. His hands started trembling and he was ‘not able to do anything one day out of three.’ There were disquieting new symptoms: involuntary twitching, fainting feelings, and black spots before his eyes” (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 361).

In 1865, Darwin described his pathetic condition to alternative therapy doctor John Chapman as follows:

“Age 56-57. For 25 years extreme spasmodic daily and nightly flatulence; occasional vomiting, on two occasions prolonged during months. Vomiting preceded by shivering, hysterical crying, dying sensations or half-faint,

and copious very pallid urine. Now vomiting and every passage of flatulence preceded by ringing of ears, treading on air and vision. Focus and black dots, air fatigues, specially risky, brings on the head symptoms, nervousness when Emma leaves me.”

Darwin sought relief from a variety of quacks. He experimented with electric chains made of brass and zinc wires, which he looped around his neck and waist. He drenched his skin with vinegar. He followed a regimen of ice-bags in the small of the back three times a day for 90 minutes at a time. He half-starved himself on crash diets. But hydropathy was his favorite remedy. He spent months at hydropathic spas, particularly James Gully’s at Malvern, Worcestershire. There he was wrapped in wet sheets, drenched with buckets of cold water, lounged for hours in mineral springs, and fed cold biscuits and water for breakfast.

By 1871, the year he published *The Descent of Man*, Darwin was “a confirmed invalid” who “sat engulfed in fog, downhearted, drawing up his will” (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 597).

Darwin’s sickness was thought by some to have been the product of his selfishness. “Self-absorbed, some thought self-centered, Charles demanded constant attention” (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 335).

His friends thought that he was a hypochondriac “because he routinely trotted his sickness out as an excuse.”

Darwin’s Deception: The Great Darwin Myth

Darwin started a myth that has been repeated *ad infinitum* by his disciples, and that is that he was a Bible-believing Christian who was an unwilling convert to evolution, capitulating to it only because of the overwhelming nature of scientific facts.

In his autobiography, Darwin presented himself as a man who was not deeply influenced by the skeptical environment in which he grew up. He claimed, in fact, to have believed the

Bible as a Cambridge student and even during his voyage on the Beagle and only gradually to have become a skeptic *solely as the product of independent scientific investigation*.

This is a self-serving myth. In fact, as we have seen, he never was a true Bible believer, never professed Christ as his Saviour, and was influenced deeply by skepticism from a young age. He was drawn to the most radical skeptics at Edinburgh. And even on the voyage, far from being influenced positively by Captain FitzRoy's faith, Darwin tried "to talk him out of it" (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 152).

Darwin claimed that he read his famous grandfather's *Zoonomia* "without producing any effect on me" (p. 49), but he then admits that he "admired greatly the *Zoonomia*." Those are contradictory statements, and it is obvious, in light of the fact that Darwin promoted the same general concept of evolution as his grandfather, that *Zoonomia* indeed had a great effect on him. In his sympathetic biography of Darwin, Jacques Barzun admits "that for every volume by the grandson there was a corresponding chapter by the grandfather" (*Darwin, Marx, Wagner*, p. 46).

Darwin claimed that before the publication of *On the Origin of Species* he "never happened to come across a single naturalist who seemed to doubt about the permanence of species" (*Autobiography*, p. 124). That is a shocking lie. His own grandfather believed in the transmutation of species and taught it in his popular book, which Charles had read *twice*. Jean Baptiste Lamarck had presented transmutation in his very influential 1809 *Philosophie Zoologique*, which Darwin had read. Many of Darwin's friends in the Plinian Society at Edinburgh University doubted the permanence of species, including his closest associate Robert Grant. He had attended Robert Jameson's evolutionary lectures that presented the transmutation of species. Darwin read Robert Chambers' 1844 *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*, which described all of creation evolving from atoms. In London, men such as James Gully were teaching "transmutation"

before Darwin published his book, and those were the circles he ran in. Gully translated Friedrich Tiedemann's "evolutionary treatise on *Comparative Physiology*" (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 219). Barzun says that "between 1810 and 1854 a score of other qualified scientists published their belief in the mutability of species" (*Darwin, Marx, Wagner*, p. 52). Irish classical scholar Benjamin Farrington observed, "No reader, however, could guess from the opening page of *The Origin* that descent with modification had a long history before Darwin took up his pen" (*What Darwin Really Said: An Introduction to His Life and Theory of Evolution*, 1982, pp. 110-111).

Darwin claimed that he came to his evolutionary theories "quite independently" of Humboldt, Lamarck, and others. But even sympathetic biographers such as Gertrude Himmelfarb characterize that as "not entirely candid." Indeed, Darwin had read many books and attended lectures promoting evolutionary ideas very similar to those he later promoted, and it is impossible to form an idea *independently* of things you have actually heard!

Darwin protested that his book *On the Origin of Species* was not a product of something that was "in the air" and denied that "men's minds were prepared for it." This is nonsense. Social historian Himmelfarb observes, "It was in the air and men were prepared for it--the public for evolution in general, and the scientific community for some special theory that Darwin was known to be working on" (*Darwin and the Darwinian Evolution*, p. 240).

Jacques Barzun says, "Clearly, the spirit of evolution hovered over the cradle of the new century" (*Darwin, Marx, Wagner*, p. 46).

Unitarianism, German "higher criticism," and humanistic philosophy had greatly weakened biblical faith within the Church of England and throughout society at large.

In *The Darwin Myth*, Benjamin Wiker observes,

“His was a close-knit family, and at least all the menfolk took for granted the self-evident truths of Enlightenment skepticism. The skepticism toward Christianity included an evolutionary account directed against the Christian, biblical doctrine of creation. It was part of the comfortable truisms passed on as a heritage. The family heritage allowed Charles to breathe in evolutionary doctrines that had been in the air for over a century ... Charles Darwin was a third generation evolutionist. He carefully read his grandfather's *Zoonomia* very early on, he studied under the radical evolutionist Robert Grant while in medical school, he worked through the arguments of the French evolutionist Lamarck, and it would be hard to imagine him not discussing evolution with his father and brother around the table and in front of the fire--all this, before he had set foot on the *Beagle*. ... It means that the theory came before the facts. It was a philosophical and cultural inheritance before Charles Darwin himself went in search of evidence to support it” (pp. 136, 137).

The fact is that Darwin's views and his book were most definitely the products of a skeptical environment. Darwin *could* have believed the Bible, because he had it in his possession and knew men that believed it, but he chose to reject it. There is no evidence that he even tried to find answers to the skeptical questions that he accepted, such as the question of suffering and homology and embryonic similarity and the geological record and the alleged contradictions in the Gospels. The answers were available, but Darwin was not interested in proving the Bible, only in disproving it. This willful skepticism has characterized committed Darwinists ever since and is a fulfillment of the prophecy of 2 Peter 3:3-6.

“Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, And saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the

beginning of the creation. For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water: Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished.”

Some have pointed to Darwin’s reference to creation at the end of *On the Origin of Species* as evidence that he continued to believe in God, but that was a mere sap thrown out by a weak man who feared the social and financial consequences of his own views. It must never be forgotten that Darwin was not a brave man. I am not aware of any occasion after the publication of *On the Origin of Species* that Darwin appeared in public to defend his book against an antagonist. He left all of that to Thomas Huxley and others. To reference “creation” in *Origin of Species* when he had rejected the concept of an intelligent creator was hypocrisy and cowardice. In fact, he came to regret it privately and expressed this in a letter to a friend to whom he admitted that he had feared public opinion:

“I have long regretted that I truckled to public opinion, and used the Pentateuchal term of creation, by which I really meant ‘appeared’ by some wholly unknown process” (Darwin, *Autobiography*. p. 272).

Alfred Russel Wallace

Darwin’s idea of natural selection, or the survival of the fittest, was actually published jointly with another naturalist named Alfred Russel Wallace (1823-1913).

An unbeliever who rejected the faith of his Christian parents, Wallace went on expeditions collecting insects in the jungles of South America, New Guinea, Borneo, and the Malay archipelago from 1848-62. From the native Indians he learned the practice of witchcraft and upon his return to England he became heavily involved in Spiritism and the communication with the dead, eventually publishing a book entitled *Miracles and Modern Spiritism*.

While in the region of New Guinea and Borneo in 1858, Wallace published a paper setting forth the doctrine of evolution through natural selection. It was titled *On the Tendency of Varieties to Depart Indefinitely from the Original Type*. He said that the idea “suddenly flashed upon” him while he was sick with malarial fever.

“It occurred to me to ask the question, Why do some die and some live? An the answer was clearly that on the whole the best fitted lived. ... There suddenly flashed upon me the idea of the survival of the fittest. The more I thought it over, the more I became convinced that I had at length found the long-sought-for law of nature that solved the problems of the Origin of Species” (cited from Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 79).

Wallace’s idea was based on the idea that species are improved by “the killing off” of the inferior and the survival of the superior. This was exactly what Darwin believed and what he later promoted in his books, and when this “survival of the fittest” proposition was applied to men it became the basis for the eugenics movement founded by Darwin’s cousin.

When Darwin and his friend Lyell received a copy of Wallace’s paper in June 1858, they rushed to go public with Darwin’s doctrine in order to give the prominence to Darwin. At a meeting of the Linnean Society on July 1, they presented Darwin and Wallace as co-founders of the doctrine of natural selection, but they claimed that Darwin had devised it first. After this, Wallace’s name was dropped and Darwin’s exalted. Twelve months after receiving Wallace’s paper, Darwin published *On the Origin of Species*.

Ian Taylor says:

“The facts of the Darwin-Wallace relationship have only come to light in recent years through the diligent efforts of [Arnold] Brackman [in his 1980 book *A Delicate Arrangement*]. Brackman presents very good reasons for crediting Wallace as the real father of the theory of the Origin of Species. Clearly, there had been a ‘delicate

arrangement' to ensure that Darwin took priority for the theory and that Wallace's name was dropped into obscurity as quickly as possible. ... Brackman brings together good circumstantial evidence to show that Darwin was guilty of plagiarism. ... All told, a great cloud of suspicion hangs over Darwin's claim of priority to the vital divergence principle" (*In the Minds of Men*, pp. 74, 80, 125).

Wallace came to believe in panentheism, in a universe permeated with "cosmic intelligence." In 1876, he published *Miracles and Modern Spiritualism*, promoting practices such as seances, automatic writing, trance speaking, and clairvoyance. He said, "My position, therefore, is that the phenomena of Spiritualism in their entirety do not require further confirmation. They are proved quite as well as any facts are proved in other sciences."

Wallace gave up his view that natural selection could account for life. In fact, he was the father of men like Teilhard de Chardin who have proposed a marriage of science and religion, of evolution and "God." He proposed "a true reconciliation of Science with Theology."

"While admitting to the full extent of the agency of the same great laws of organic development in the origin of the human race as in the origin of all organized beings, **there yet seems to be evidence of a Power which has guided the action of those laws in definite directions and for special ends.** ... **Let us not shut our eyes to the evidence that an Overruling Intelligence has watched over the action of those laws,** so directing variations and so determining their accumulation, as finally to produce an organization sufficiently perfect to admit of, and even to aid in, the indefinite advancement of our mental and moral nature" (Wallace, "Sir Charles Lyell on Geological Climates and the Origin Of Species," *Quarterly Review*, April 18679, pp. 393, 394).

Wallace was a New Ager. While rejecting the sovereign Creator God of the Bible, he believed in a pantheistic “Power,” an “Overruling Intelligence” that is evolving everything toward an objective. A few years later, Teilhard de Chardin, a Roman Catholic paleoanthropologist who was involved in the discovery of the Piltdown Man and participated in the description of Peking Man, proposed that everything is evolving toward an “Omega Point.” To Teilhard, all men’s souls constitute the “soul of the world” that is evolving toward an “ultimate convergence in perfection on Omega and the Christ” (Anne Bancroft, *Twentieth-Century Mystics*, p. 55). Thus, man is part of the divine and will eventually merge with it. He called his doctrine of evolution the Law of Complexity, claiming that the Omega Point is drawing the universe to itself so that it is being guided toward ever higher states of consciousness. He described the Omega Point as a divine personal intellectual being that is outside of the framework of evolution and that is guiding the evolution.

This New Age merger of science with religion has spread widely in our day. It is even promoted in the Spitzer Hall of Human Origins at the American Museum of Natural History. The displays depict man as a product of blind Darwinian evolution and brashly contradict the Bible’s account of creation, but a video presentation features some prominent evolutionists claiming that science and religion are friends. Francis Collins, director of the Human Genome Project, says, “I’m a scientist that believes the tools of science are the way to understand the natural world and one needs to be rigorous about that. But I’m also a believer in a personal God. I find the scientific worldview and the spiritual worldview to be entirely complementary. And I find it quite wonderful to be able to have both of those worldviews existing in my life in a given day, because each illuminates the other.” This might sound respectful toward “religion,” but in fact it is a bold repudiation of the Bible, because the Bible refuses to speak only about “religious things.” The Bible begins with the

account of how the material universe was made, so it refuses to leave such things to “science.” And if the Bible is wrong about the material universe there is no reason to believe it is right about anything else and no reason to “respect” its teachings on any other subject.

As for Darwin, he was sharply opposed to the marriage of God and evolution. When Wallace wrote to Darwin to express this opinion that man could only be accounted for by the “Divine Will,” Darwin wrote across the paper ‘NO!’ and underlined it three times heavily. In his reply Darwin said, “I differ grievously from you and I am very sorry for it. I hope you have not murdered too completely your own and my child” (Loren Eiseley, *Darwin’s Century: Evolution and the Men who Discovered It*).

Benjamin Wiker observes:

“Darwin’s principle of natural selection was chosen by him precisely because it excluded any creative action by God. That is why he was so upset with Lyell and Wallace, and murmured against Gray. They kept letting in God” (*The Darwin Myth*, p. 139).

The Loss of His First Daughter

When Darwin’s beloved daughter Annie died at age nine, he was devastated, but there was nowhere to turn except to bitter blasphemy.

Not long before her death, Darwin had delighted in the biography of Francis William Newman, *Phases of Faith*. It described a skeptic’s journey from convinced Anglicanism, to doubting the Bible, to rejecting hell, to Unitarianism, to ‘the fringes of free religion.’ Newman came to believe that the Old Testament is full of myths and “moral monstrosities” and that Jesus did not speak the words attributed to him in the New Testament. Darwin read this on Sundays when Emma was a church, and when he finished it he proclaimed it “excellent” (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 378). By now he considered the doctrine of eternal punishment “monstrous.”

When his daughter fell grievously sick shortly thereafter, Darwin had nowhere to turn. Instead of praying to God, he pursued alternative medical remedies until there was no hope and then drowned himself in grief.

Darwin's biographers typically claim that this was the final crushing of Darwin's faith, and that is what Darwin said, but in reality he had rejected the God of the Bible decades earlier. This was just a convenient excuse.

The hardening of conscience and deadening of soul

The Bible warns that light rejected results in increased darkness and the conscience ignored is hardened. Darwin unwittingly described this process in his own life. We have quoted his autobiography in which he spoke of the "higher feelings of wonder, admiration, and devotion that filled his mind" when as a young man he stood in the midst of a Brazilian forest. As he aged, this wonder disappeared, as reflected in the following sad and frightful testimony,

"But now the grandest scenes would not cause any such convictions and feelings to rise in my mind" (Barlow, *The Autobiography of Charles Darwin*, p. 91).

Darwin's Accolades

Darwin received great accolades. He was awarded the Royal Society's Copley Medal, England's highest scientific award, and the praise only increased after his death. More than 120 animals and plants have been named after him (such as the sloth *Myiodon Darwinii* and the fish *Cossyphus Darwini*). There is a Mount Darwin in the Andes, a Darwin Sound at the southern tip of South America and another in British Columbia, a Darwin city in Australia, a Darwin University, a Darwin National Park, a Darwin Foundation, and a Darwin Research Station. There is an annual Darwin Day. His image has appeared on an English ten pound note and a two pound coin. 2009 was dubbed the Year of Darwin.

It is a frightful reminder of Jesus' warning, "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his

own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?” (Matthew 16:26).

Darwin was Warned

Many men disagreed with Darwin’s doctrine of evolution in his lifetime, even in the Church of England. Many of the most influential scientists disagreed with him, and they warned of the social consequences of his principle.

Adam Sedgwick, professor of geology at Cambridge, told Darwin that some parts of *Origin* he found laughable and others he read with sorrow, “because I think them utterly false and grievously mischievous” (Himmelfarb, p. 268). Sedgwick called the *Origin* “a dish of rank materialism cleverly cooked up ... for no other reason, I am sure, except to make us independent of a Creator” (Ronald Clark, *The Survival of Charles Darwin*, p. 139). Sedgwick solemnly warned Darwin about trying to divorce nature from the “moral or metaphysical” and prophesied that if such a break were made “humanity would suffer a damage that might brutalize it, and sink the human race into a lower grade of degradation than any into which it has fallen since its written records tell us of its history” (Himmelfarb, p. 269).

Even Charles Lyell, the father of uniformitarian geology, was “tormented” over the fear that Darwin’s doctrine would result in “human degradation.” He “agonized about the moral consequences,” fearing that “humanity would lose its noble rank and submerge in brutal nature” (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 442).

Countless others issued the same warning, and this is exactly what has happened. The ascent of atheistic evolution has been accompanied by unspeakable moral degradation and brutalization, from Stalin to Hitler to Mao to Pot Pol, from legalized abortion to child pornography, from euthanasia to bestiality. If man is an animal there is no compelling reason why he should not pursue any inclination,

and if there is no Creator there is no basis for absolute morality.

Darwin's Death

Having rejected the Bible and God and the doctrine of eternal life, Darwin was left with no meaning in life and a bleak future in which man is doomed to perish in a dying universe.

“With respect to immortality, nothing shows me how strong and almost instinctive a belief it is, as the consideration of the view now held by most physicists, namely that the sun with all the planets will in time grow too cold for life, unless indeed some great body dashes into the sun and thus gives it fresh life.--Believing as I do that man in the distant future will be a far more perfect creature than he now is, it is an intolerable thought that he and all other sentient beings are doomed to complete annihilation after such long-continued slow progress” (*Autobiography*, p. 92).

Before his death, Darwin professed “no assured and ever present belief in the existence of a personal God or of a future existence with retribution and reward” (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 636).

Interestingly, though, the last words of this man who had no belief in God were “Oh God, oh Lord God.” Every agnostic and every atheist believes in God in his heart of hearts.

Darwin was buried in Westminster Abbey with a full-blown Anglican funeral. The “elders of science, State, and Church, the nobility of birth and talent” were in attendance. It was called “the greatest gathering of intellect that was ever brought together in our country.”

The Darwins and Wedgewoods gathered in the Jerusalem Chamber, where one of the committees had met to work on the King James Bible and where, more recently, the English

Revised Version committee led by Westcott and Hort had deliberated.

Among his pall bearers were the old X-Clubbers Huxley and Hooker and New Ager Alfred Wallace.

The coffin was draped in black velvet and covered with white flowers. Choristers sang "I am the resurrection." A special hymn composed for the occasion was taken from the book of Proverbs. Incongruously, it began, "Happy is the man that findeth wisdom, and getting understanding," and ended with, "He ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace."

As the coffin was lowered into the grave, the choristers sang, "His body is buried in peace, but his name liveth evermore."

Did Darwin Convert on His Deathbed?

The following is excerpted from "Was Darwin a Christian," ChristianAnswers.net:

"In the years following Darwin's death in 1882 several stories surfaced that he had undergone a death-bed conversion and renounced evolution. The best known is that attributed to a Lady Hope, who claimed she had visited a bedridden Charles at Down House in the autumn of 1881. ... This story first appeared in print as a 521-word article in the American Baptist journal, the *Watchman Examiner*, and since then has been reprinted in many books, magazines and tracts. The main problem with these stories is that they were denied by members of Darwin's family. Francis Darwin wrote to Thomas Huxley on February 8, 1887, that a report that Charles had renounced evolution on his deathbed was 'false and without any kind of foundation,' and in 1917 Francis affirmed that he had 'no reason whatever to believe that he [his father] ever altered his agnostic point of view.' Charles's daughter (Henrietta Litchfield) wrote on page 12 of the London evangelical weekly, *The Christian*, dated February 23, 1922, 'I was present at his deathbed. Lady

Hope was not present during his last illness, or any illness. I believe he never even saw her, but in any case she had no influence over him in any department of thought or belief. He never recanted any of his scientific views, either then or earlier.' Darwin's biographer, Dr. James Moore, produced a 218-page book examining what he calls *The Darwin Legend*. ... Moore concludes that Lady Hope probably did visit Charles between Wednesday, September 28 and Sunday, October 2, 1881, almost certainly when Francis and Henrietta were absent, but his wife, Emma, probably was present. He describes Lady Hope as 'a skilled raconteur [storyteller], able to summon up poignant scenes and conversations, and embroider them with sentimental spirituality.' He points out that her published story contained some authentic details as to time and place, but also factual inaccuracies--Charles was not bedridden six months before he died, and the summer house was far too small to accommodate 30 people. The most important aspect of the story, however, is that it does not say that Charles either renounced evolution or embraced Christianity. He merely is said to have expressed concern over the fate of his youthful speculations and to have spoken in favor of a few people's attending a religious meeting. The alleged recantation/conversion is embellishment that others have either read into the story or made up for themselves. Moore calls such doings 'holy fabrication!' ... While the spiritual journey of a Christian is a journey out of darkness into Christ's marvelous light, that of Charles Darwin was a slippery slide out of Gospel light (although not saving spiritual sight) into the sheer 'blackness of darkness for ever.'"

Darwin's Deification

Darwin was buried in Westminster Abbey. Three years after his death, a life-sized statue was erected in the most prominent place in the new Natural History Museum. *The Times* called it "The Temple of Nature," and Pope Huxley presided over the dedication ceremony.

At some point in the 20th century, the statue was moved to another area of the museum, but on the 100th anniversary of Darwin's death, it was restored to a place of prominence, where it remains today, looking for all the world like an idol enshrined in a temple.

Thomas Huxley

Darwin's Bulldog

Thomas Huxley (1825-1895) was called “Darwin’s Bulldog” because he was the premier public defender of Darwinian evolution in Darwin’s day. Whereas Charles Darwin was reclusive and mild tempered, Huxley was combative and loved the limelight. “Never one to enter the public fray, Darwin needed a champion as Huxley needed a cause” (Desmond, *Huxley*, p. 260).

Huxley’s biographer says he lived in a “fantasy world” as a child, “escaping into a secret realm of science” (Adrian Desmond, *Huxley*, p. 6). His greatest influences were skeptics, such as Unitarians who were developing new forms of knowledge “based on natural causes rather than the Anglican’s miracles.” He grew up in Coventry, the same place where “George Eliot lost her Puritan faith.” At age 12 Huxley was deeply influenced by James Hutton’s *Theory of the Earth*, which denied the Bible’s account of creation and the Flood. As a teenager he spent Sundays arguing metaphysics with skeptics such as George May. It was May who introduced Huxley to Southwood Smith’s *Divine Government*, which was “the Unitarian bible.” These influences rejected the divinity of Christ and the miracles of the Bible.

Huxley had fleeting fears that skepticism would destroy the moral fiber of society, and those fears have proven true, but his conscience was hardened and by age 17 he had become a “long-haired radical” (Desmond, pp. 17, 18).

In 1855, he married Henrietta (“Nettie”) Heathorn. She was a pious Anglican and their discussions on religion were conducted “under a dark cloud” (Desmond, p. 75). He freely expressed his doubts about “Genesis myths, and miraculous interventions, Afterlife and Atonement,” and when he attended church with her he was always “foul tempered” and considered the preaching “the greatest absurdities.” All of this

worried her deeply. In one letter she wrote the following pathetic words:

“I am often very unhappy about his sentiments--I have such need of leading unto holy things ... that I fondly hoped he would have been the guide and instructor unto more perfect ways--but here my hopes have borne bitter fruit. Something has come over me of late; I cannot pray as fervently as I did” (Desmond, p. 132).

Observe that her relationship with the unbelieving skeptic hindered her prayer life. The Bible says that if we put anything before God we are guilty of idolatry. Jesus said that if we love even our dearest relatives more than Him we are not worthy of Him. Henrietta rightly understood that she needed a husband that would teach and encourage her in the faith, but she let her emotions rather than God's Word rule her life.

Nettie held out for Huxley's conversion, writing before their marriage, “May we love and grow old together and dying may we meet again in Heaven” (p. 81).

It was a vain hope, because Huxley only grew more confirmed in his unbelief.

When his first son died at age four, the grieving Huxley rejected the idea that he needed “the hope and consolation” of Christ and considered the temptation to turn to such a hope “a scoffing devil.” When the preacher read about the bodily resurrection from 1 Corinthians 15 at the funeral, Huxley said, “They shocked me,” and, “I could have laughed with scorn” (Desmond, pp. 287, 288). Calling good evil and evil good, Huxley claimed that biblical faith is “the unpardonable sin” (p. 345).

Like Darwin, Huxley was an evolutionary racist. He wrote,

“No rational man, cognizant of the facts, believes that the average negro is the equal, still less the superior, of the white man” (*Lay Sermons, Addresses and Reviews*, 1871, p. 20).

Huxley argued that regardless of what privileges are given to the black man he will not “be able to compete successfully with his bigger-brained and smaller-jawed rival [Caucasians], in a contest which is to be carried on by thoughts and not by bites.”

On a visit to New Guinea, Huxley decided that it would be good if the Aborigines were wiped out. Their “elimination ... from the earth’s surface can be viewed only with satisfaction, as the removal of a great blot from the escutcheon of our common humanity” (Adrian Desmond, *Huxley*, p. 144).

Huxley’s life spanned a time of great change. It looked like science would conquer every human problem and carry men into a glorious millennium. The transatlantic cable carried messages instantly across vast oceans. Railroads crisscrossed England on 6,800 miles of track by 1851, drawing far-flung towns together and accelerating the pace of life. The newly opened London Underground carried men quickly from one side of the great city to the other. Cities were building modern sewage systems to “flush out medieval diseases.” Alexander Graham Bell’s telephone was the first step toward the Internet. The typewriter revolutionized writing, and Thomas Edison’s light bulb turned night into day, allowing men to work around the clock and carry forth the scientific revolution with even greater speed.

Huxley’s Assault on God and Bible

In this time of great change, skepticism was in the air. It seemed like the Bible would become just another religious fable to fall before mighty science. Huxley said,

“Every thinking man I have met with is at heart in a state of doubt, on all the great points of religious faith. And the unthinking men ... are in as complete a state of practical unbelief” (Huxley, 1851, cited from Desmond, p. 160).

Huxley counted radical skeptics such as Herbert Spencer, John Stuart Mill, George Holyoake, and George Eliot among his best friends. “Secularity” was their watchword.

They wanted “a hammer to break the creationist shackles” (Desmond, p. 186), and Darwinism became that hammer. It was also described as “a cleansing solvent, dissolving the dross” of biblical miracles (p. 306).

Huxley thrived in this “sea-mist of rationalism” (Desmond, p. 169), and became one of the prominent voices in England for the overthrow of the Christian faith. He called Darwinism the “New Reformation.” Huxley wanted to “see the foot of Science on the necks of her Enemies” (p. 253), and his children in the evolutionary faith have lived to see that dream fulfilled to a great degree.

Huxley boasted,

“Science and her methods gave me a resting place independent of authority and tradition” (Clodd, *Thomas Henry Huxley*, 1902, p. 15).

Huxley eventually attacked the resurrection of Christ. In his article “The Evolution of Theology,” which was published in *Nineteenth Century* magazine, Huxley claimed that Jehovah God was a product of evolution. He blasphemously hated the “Elohim ghost-deity” of the Old Testament who “policed moral behaviour with promises of rewards and threats of unearthly torment” (p. 547). It is obvious that he did not understand either God or His Gospel. Huxley called the account of Jesus casting out the demons in Gadarene “preposterous and immoral.” He claimed that Jesus was just another orthodox Jewish teacher. He called Paul’s theology “Neoplatonic mystigogy” (p. 571). Huxley’s largest book, *Controverted Questions*, was on Biblical criticism.

Huxley even competed with churches directly through his “Sunday Evenings for the People” lectures. These were even given religious-like trappings. Huxley would enter with Haydn’s *Creation* blasting from a church organ “to heighten the sense of awe” (Desmond, p. 345). Huxley’s lecture was enthusiastic and sermon-like. His God was “the Unknown”; his faith was man; his Bible was science; his gospel was

scientific achievement. Instead of divine purpose, Huxley preached naturalistic chance.

Huxley had a great capacity for hatred, and he loved “trashing reputations and received wisdom” (Desmond, p. 227). The *Pall Mall Gazette* said that “cutting up monkeys was his forte, and cutting up men was his foible.” He said, “There is no doubt I have a hot bad temper. If I hate a man, I despise him” (p. 213), and he aimed the full force of that temper at Bible believers. He was a “parson hater.” Huxley said of scientists who resisted Darwinism, “I should like to get my heel into their mouths and scr-r-unch it round” (Lord Ernie, “Victorian Memoirs and Memories,” *The Quarterly Review*, 1923, cited from Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 363). Of Richard Owen, one of the scientists holding out against Darwinism, Huxley said, “Before I have done with that mendacious humbug I will nail him out, like a kite to a barn door, an example to all evil doers” (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 504). And Owen was not even a true Bible believer; his Christian faith was liberal.

Of anyone who attempted to defend the Bible at any level, even those compromisers who were trying to reconcile it with evolution, proud Huxley said that if he “were Commander in Chief in their universe” he would dump them in a “hot locus in the lower regions” (p. 505). Thus, the man who mocked the the idea of a God of judgment who would send men to hell, would have sent his own enemies to such a place if he had the power! What unmitigated hypocrisy!

As Huxley grew in prominence, he used his influence to reach two major objectives: to make a name for himself (Desmond, *Huxley*, p. 189) and to exalt doubt over faith, science over the Bible, man over God. He accomplished both objectives, but he lost his soul in the process.

Huxley intended to take control of science in England and he was largely successful. He founded the secretive X-Club, which was dedicated to “science, pure and free, untrammelled by religious dogmas.” “Opponents were locked out, ignored,

and mocked” (Wiker, *The Darwin Myth*, p. 105). Huxley’s X-Club nickname was Xalted.

“... it consisted of nine members who, with one exception, were all presidents and secretaries of learned societies; the one exception was Herbert Spencer, whom we shall meet in the final chapter. These nine were men at the top of their profession, hand picked for their views, and holding personal influence on almost every famous scientist in the world, as well as on many distinguished radicals. The members met for dinner always immediately before each meeting of the Royal Society, at which time strategy was plotted. By this means, British science was literally ‘governed’, from 1864 until 1884, by Huxley and his disciples, and, with their combined influence over the scientific press” (Ian Taylor, *In the Mind of Man*, pp. 182-185).

From X-Club ranks came three presidents of the Royal Society and five presidents of the British Association (Jacques Barzun, *Darwin, Marx, Wagner*, p. 35).

Cambridge biology teacher Michael Pitman observes:

“It is certain that the ‘gay and conspiratorial’ X Club, which was strongly evolutionist in character, not only influenced the appointments made for senior positions in the newly formed universities of the Victorian era but also, until its demise in the 1890s, practically controlled the business of the Royal Society” (*Adam and Evolution*, p. 64).

The X-Club published its own periodical called *Nature* as part of their aggressive campaign of selling Darwinism to the public.

As of 2009, *Nature* was still standing true to its founding vision. In January of that year *Nature* published a free online packet titled “15 Evolutionary Gems.” One report observed that it might have been subtitled “An evangelism packet for those wishing to spread the good news about Darwinism.” The packet urged scientists and their institutions to “spread

the word” that evolution is “an established fact.” The back page of the packet featured a glorification of Darwin consisting of a mythical picture of an attractive young Darwin (contrary to reality) surrounded harmoniously by all sorts of animals and plant life. Darwin appears almost like the “god of nature.”

Huxley’s Inquisition

Science became the new religion and scientists the new priests. There was “One Catholic Apostolic Church of True Knowledge.”

Pope Huxley and his fellow bishops in the Church of Science brought back the inquisition by disallowing challenges to evolutionary doctrine and excommunicating those who dared to question it. Consider St. George Mivart, who was “excommunicated from the Church of Science.” He started out as an ardent evolutionist and a disciple of Huxley, but he was savaged when he had the audacity to publish a book debunking Darwinism and warning that it would destroy morality and produce despair (Desmond, *Huxley*, p. 455). The Huxley inquisitors had Mivart’s membership in the prestigious Athenaeum Club nixed. Mivart was shunned as a leper by the Darwinian elite, and he wasn’t even a Bible believer; he was a liberal Roman Catholic who held to theistic evolution.

Mivart was only the first victim of the Darwinian inquisition, a phenomenon that has broadened in scope and intensity in our day.

By 1995, Phillip Johnson observed:

“Darwinian theory is the creation myth of our culture. It’s the officially sponsored, government financed creation myth that the public is supposed to believe in, and that creates the evolutionary scientists as the priesthood. ... So we have the priesthood of naturalism, which has great cultural authority, and of course has to protect its mystery that gives it that authority--that’s why they’re so vicious

towards critics" (*In the Beginning: The Creationist Controversy*, PBS documentary, May 30-31, 1995).

Richard Milton, a science journalist, published a book in 1981 debunking Darwinian evolution and subsequently became the target of the Darwinian gestapo. In his review of Milton's *Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, Oxford University atheist Richard Dawkins devoted two-thirds of the review to attacking the publisher for daring to print a book criticizing Darwinism and the other third to assassinating Milton's character. Dawkins said the book is "loony," "stupid," "drivel," and referred to Milton as a "harmless fruitcake" who "needs psychiatric help" (*Shattering the Myths*, pp. ix, x).

Dawkins has tried to have Milton blacklisted so that his scientific writings cannot be published. He has lied about him, calling him a "secret creationist." He was successful in having the *Times Higher Educational Supplement* stop publication of one of Milton's articles.

Milton describes one group of Darwinist vigilantes who use the Internet to attack those they find guilty of promoting the heresy of Intelligent Design. They call themselves "howler monkeys." Milton says, "The effects of the howler monkeys of the Internet are profoundly damaging to academic freedom of expression, whoever their current victim happens to be" (p. 270).

Milton observes, "There is a strong streak of intellectual arrogance and intellectual authoritarianism running through the history of Darwinism, from Thomas Huxley and Charles Darwin ... through to Julian Huxley" (*Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, p. 277).

In 2007, astronomer Guillermo Gonzalez, author of *The Privileged Planet*, was denied tenure at Iowa State University in spite of his excellent record because he believes in intelligent design ("Guillermo Gonzalez, Nobel Laureates and Founders of Modern Science," *Evolution News & Views*, June 5, 2007).

Dr. Frank Tipler, a distinguished professor of physics at the University of New Orleans, was persecuted after he merely admitted the possibility of intelligence in his book *The Physics of Immortality*. He complains that the “peer review” process is a tool to enforce Darwinian orthodoxy:

“Today, the refereeing process works primarily to enforce orthodoxy. I shall offer evidence that ‘peer’ review is not peer review: the referee is quite often not as intellectually able as the author whose work he judges. We have pygmies standing in judgment on giants” (“Refereed Journals: Do They Insure Quality or Enforce Orthodoxy?” ISCID Archiv. June 30, 2003, p. 8, cited from Henry Morris, “Willingly Ignorant,” ICR).

Joan Margueijo exposes the peer review system as an instrument of enforcing doctrinaire purity within the Darwinian establishment:

“As an individual you are judged by how many papers you publish, where you publish them, their quality, and how often they are subsequently cited. But more importantly, publication is part and parcel of the fact that scientists, who tend to live on grant money, are obligated to make their findings and ideas available to others. They will not get their share of funding unless they can show a solid publication record. ... Referee reports are often empty of scientific content and reflect nothing but the author's social standing, or their good or bad relations with the referee. . . . To cap it all, editors can be totally illiterate” (*Faster than the Spread of Light*, 2003, pp. 183, 217, 218).

In 1997, Dr. Lynn Margulis and Dr. Dorion Sagan, both evolutionists with impeccable scientific credentials, made the following admission:

“More and more, like the monasteries of the Middle Ages, today's universities and professional societies guard their knowledge. Collusively, the university biology curriculum, the textbook publishers, the National Science

Foundation review committees, the Graduate Record examiners, and the various microbiological, evolutionary, and zoological societies map out domains of the known and knowable; they distinguish required from forbidden knowledge, subtly punishing the trespassers with rejection and oblivion; they award the faithful liturgists by granting degrees and dispersing funds and fellowships. Universities and academies ... determine who is permitted to know and just what it is that he or she may know. Biology, botany, zoology, biochemistry, and microbiology departments within U.S. universities determine access to knowledge about life, dispensing it at high prices in peculiar parcels called credit hours. ... **If an individual with ambition to study nature rejects neo-Darwinist biology in today's ambience, he becomes a threat to his own means of livelihood**" (Lynn Margulis and Dorion Sagan, *Slanted Truths: Essays on Gaia, Symbiosis, and Evolution*, 1997, pp. 236, 279).

Dr. Hannes Alfvén made the same complaint. Since he disagreed from the Darwinian establishment's commitment to the big bang doctrine, his papers were turned down in spite of his impressive scientific credentials ("Memoirs of a Dissident Scientist," *American Scientist*, May-June 1988, p. 250).

The Darwinian inquisition has largely shut creationists out of the public school/scientific establishment. Dr. Henry Morris described this extreme bias:

"It is not that creationist scientists have not published in their own scientific fields. For example, before coming to ICR, Dr. Duane Gish had published at least 25 articles on biochemistry in secular science journals, Dr. Ken Cumming over 18 articles in biology, and Dr. Larry Vardiman at least 10 articles in atmospheric physics. My own publications in engineering include five books and 20 articles. One of the books, *Applied Hydraulics in Engineering*, has been continuously in print since 1963 and has been used as a textbook in scores of universities.

“But none of us can get a scientific article promoting creationism published in the secular journals, whether technical journals or popular magazines such as *Reader's Digest* or *National Geographic*. In fact, very few religious magazines will accept an article on creationism, especially one that promotes six-day creation and a global Flood.

“On one occasion, a member of the Society of Exploration Geophysicists was able to get an invitation for me to speak at their convention, with an agreement that the Society would publish the paper in its journal. When they saw my paper, however, they quickly reneged, even though the article had no religious material in it at all, only science. It was later published by ICR as the small book, *The Scientific Case for Creation*” (Morris, “Bigotry in Science,” Institute for Creation Research, n.d.).

Countless other examples could be given. In fact, entire books have been written to document the Darwinian inquisition.

In *Darwin Day in America*, John Day devotes a chapter to this entitled “Banned in Burlington.”

In the video documentary *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed*, Ben Stein examines the persecution of scientists and professors who dare to question Darwinism or to promote even the slightest evidence for intelligent design.

In *Slaughter of the Dissidents* (Southworth, WA: Leafcutter Press, 2008), Jerry Bergman (Ph.D. in human biology from Columbia Pacific University and Ph.D. in measurement and evaluation from Wayne State University) tells the “shocking truth about killing the careers of Darwin doubters.” In the Introduction, John Eidsmoe says: “In this fascinating book, Dr. Jerry Bergman--himself a victim--chronicles the history of modern religious persecution in America. A highly respected, credentialed, and published professor, he was denied tenure--and subsequently fired--admittedly because of his creationist beliefs and writings. Dr. Bergman describes numerous other cases, often concealing names to protect

those who do not wish to risk losing their current positions (a common means of persecuting those with minority views)” (p. xv).

Dr. Bergman testifies:

“[A] factor that moved me to the creationist side was the underhanded, often totally unethical techniques that evolutionists typically used to suppress dissonant ideas, primarily creationism. Rarely did they carefully and objectively examine the facts, but usually focused on suppression of creationists, denial of their degrees, denial of their tenure, *ad hominem* attacks, and in general, irrational attacks on their person. In short, their response in general was totally unscientific and one that reeks of intolerance, even hatred” (*Persuaded by the Evidence*, chapter 4).

William Dembski adds:

“As Michael Behe pointed out in an interview with the *Harvard Political Review* for a biologist to question Darwinism endangers one’s career. ‘There’s good reason to be afraid. Even if you’re not fired from your job, you will easily be passed over for promotions. I would strongly advise graduate students who are skeptical of Darwinian theory not to make their views known.’ ... Doubting Darwinian orthodoxy is comparable to opposing the party line of a Stalinist regime. ... Overzealous critics of intelligent design regard it as their moral duty to keep biology free from intelligent design, even if that means taking extreme measures. I’ve known such critics to contact design theorists’ employers and notify them of the ‘heretics’ in their midst. Once ‘outed,’ the design theorists themselves get harassed and harangued with e-mails. Next, the press does a story mentioning their unsavory intelligent design associations. (The day one such story appeared, a close friend and colleague of mine mentioned in the story was dismissed from his research position at a prestigious molecular biology laboratory. He had worked in that lab for ten

years. ... Welcome to the inquisition" (*The Design Revolution*, pp. 304, 305).

Walt Brown, who has a Ph.D. in mechanical engineering from MIT, describes the way that evolutionists have controlled the scientific fields since the day of Thomas Huxley. He uses the field of geology as an example:

"Professors in the new and growing field of geology were primarily selected from those who supported the anti-catastrophe principle. These professors did not advance students who espoused catastrophes. An advocate of a global flood was branded a 'biblical literalist' or 'fuzzy thinker'--not worthy of an academic degree. Geology professors also influenced, through the peer review process, what papers could be published. Textbooks soon reflected their orthodoxy, so few students became 'fuzzy thinkers.' This practice continues to this day, because a major criterion for selecting professors is the number of their publications" (*In the Beginning*, p. 253).

Consider Dr. Caroline Crocker, a cell-biologist and full-time visiting faculty member at George Mason University. After she showed several slides about intelligent design in a class on cells, she was reprimanded, pulled from lecture duties, and her contract was not renewed the following semester. She testified: "Students are not allowed to question Darwinism. There are universities where they poll students on what they believe and single them out."

Some Darwinists have even hinted at or openly called for the imprisonment of creationists.

"Richard Dawkins has written that anyone who denies evolution is either 'ignorant, stupid or insane (or wicked--but I'd rather not consider that)' (*New York Times*, April 9, 1989, sec. 7, p. 34). It isn't a big step from calling someone wicked to taking forceful measures to put an end to their wickedness. John Maddox, the editor of *Nature*, has written in his journal that 'it may not be long before the practice of religion must be regarded as anti-

science' ('Defending Science Against Anti-Science,' *Nature*, 368, 185). In his recent book *Darwin's Dangerous Idea*, philosopher Daniel Dennett compares religious believers--90 percent of the population--to wild animals who may have to be caged, and he says that parents should be prevented (presumably by coercion) from misinforming their children about the truth of evolution, which is so evident to him" (Michael Behe, *Darwin's Black Box*, chapter 11).

The reason that the aforementioned St. George Mivart was treated so savagely by Huxley's crowd is that his refutation of Darwinism was effective, and the same is true for the targets of the Darwinian thought police today. In spite of what staunch Darwinists pretend, they do not want an open and free discussion of their theories. The only way they can deal with the truth is through icons, just-so stories, ridicule, smoke screens, and straw men, and when that doesn't work they descend to merciless personal attacks.

Consider six powerful evidences that Mivart gave against "natural selection" --

"(1) It is incompetent to account for the incipient stages of useful structures, because the first stages cannot yet contribute to survival and so, wouldn't be selected. (2) Similar biological structures develop from wholly different origins, something that couldn't happen by mere random variation. (3) There are biological grounds for believing that the evolutionary transition between species may be developed suddenly instead of gradually. (4) Species have definite though very different limits to their variability. (5) Certain fossil transitional forms are absent, which might have been expected to be present. (6) There are many remarkable phenomena in organic forms upon which natural selection throws no light whatever, such as the flounder, whose eyes shift from both sides of the head when it is young and swims upright to one side when it matures and swims flattened on the bottom. 'How such transit of one eye a minute fraction of the journey

towards the other side of the head could benefit the individual is indeed far from clear” (Wiker, *The Darwin Myth*, pp. 126, 127).

Though Huxley is called “Darwin’s Bulldog,” even he doubted Darwin’s doctrine of natural selection, which is the very heart of Darwin’s principle. For Huxley, Darwinism was a hammer to destroy biblical creationism, and whether or not it was scientifically true was really beside the point! Huxley’s sympathetic biographer says, “But the details were never of overriding importance to Huxley. Whether or not the *Origin* pointed to a Golden Calf, it led his Israelites out of the wilderness. ... **Huxley was exuberantly endorsing the naturalism of Darwin’s vision, not the fine points of his theory**” (Desmond, pp. 259, 262). Huxley foolishly looked upon biblical faith as a “wilderness,” and any idol was preferable.

Huxley coined the term “agnostic” to describe the state of supposedly not knowing whether there is a God and glorifying a skeptical mindset. The term, which means “no knowledge,” was adopted by Darwin. Huxley’s biographer said, “Agnosticism was to become the new faith of the West.” Karl Marx’s son-in-law, Edward Aveling, in his 1897 article “Charles Darwin and Karl Marx,” rightly observed that “Atheist is only Agnostic writ aggressive, and Agnostic is only Atheist writ respectable.” Lenin said that Huxley’s “agnosticism serves as a fig-leaf for materialism” (*Materialism and Empirio-criticism*).

Huxley’s Evolutionary Art

Deceitful art has been a major vehicle for the promotion of evolution from its inception, and Huxley was guilty of this. Like Ernst Haeckel, Huxley doctored his evolutionary charts. The frontispiece to *Zoological Evidences as to Man’s Place in Nature* (1863) featured a drawing comparing four ape skeletons with a human one. The gibbon was drawn twice its normal size. All four of the apes are depicted standing up,

which is not their natural position. And the man is stooped, which is also unnatural. This was done to make it look more feasible at a glance that the ape could evolve into man, and it is a lie.

Far more people have been influenced by the mythical evolutionary artwork than by evolutionary writings.

Evolutionary Propagandist

In Huxley's lifetime a radical change came over England, and he played a large part in this phenomenon. His biographer describes him as an "evolutionary propagandist and proselytizer of a new scientific authority" (p. 617). He was a revolutionist. When Huxley was young, Darwinism was largely rejected in the halls of science and by the Church of England, but by the time Huxley was old, Charles Darwin was honored by a burial in Westminster Abbey and his statue was placed in the most prominent place in the British Museum of Natural History. When Huxley was young, Unitarian skeptic Joseph Priestley was widely condemned and his views soundly rejected, but by 1874 a statue was raised in Birmingham to honor the heretic and Huxley presided over its dedication. In the 1850s the theological modernism of *Essays and Reviews* was roundly condemned by Anglican priests and leaders, including the Bishop of Oxford, and some of the modernists were condemned in ecclesiastical court, but by the 1880s the modernists were in positions of authority everywhere and the Bible believers were being persecuted. What Huxley wrote against the Bible in the 1880s, "no decent magazine would have dared to publish" 30 years before. When Robert Gascoyne-Cecil, chancellor of Oxford University, honored Darwin in 1894 and praised the "revolution" he brought to England, Huxley remarked to his fellow pioneer in skepticism Joseph Hooker, "It was very queer to sit there and hear the doctrines that you and I were damned for advocating 34 years ago at Oxford, enunciated as matters of course--disputed by no reasonable

man! - - in the Sheldonian theatre by the Chancellor” (Desmond, p. 605).

Huxley realized that education was the key to the promotion of evolution and the overthrow of the Bible in men’s hearts. “How to break the hold of the sermon? Get science into the classroom, Huxley answered” (Desmond, p. 272). At first he first advocated using the Bible in the schools after removing everything that “men of science” disagree with. *That* would be a small Bible! It reminds me of *The Positive Bible* which removes everything that is “negative.” It is a very thin book! Later Huxley called for the removal of the Bible from classrooms entirely (p. 580).

Since Huxley’s day Darwin’s disciples have taken over the public education systems and brainwashed generation after generation of gullible, unsuspecting students. This is why the Darwinists have fought so hard and have been willing to use any trick in the book, including deception, to keep “intelligent design” from being taught in America’s classrooms.

Huxley also understood the power of the printed page. Steam presses were pumping out cheap books that were carried quickly by trains throughout the country, and the skeptics used this to mass market their unbelief. Huxley’s lectures sold by the thousands. Modernist John Colenso’s book debunking the Pentateuch and Huxley’s sympathetic treatise on the humanistic philosopher David Hume sold 10,000 copies each within months. Skeptical tabloids percolated through the land.

Huxley and Darwin both believed that a moral code can be maintained even if one rejects God and believes in naturalistic evolution. Huxley proclaimed that though man descended from “brutes,” he is assuredly not *of them*,” which makes no sense whatsoever. He held out for a high moral code that included traditional marriage, but Huxley was wrong to pretend that the doctrine of evolution would not destroy morality. If there is no law-giving creator God, there

is no basis for absolute morality. If man is a product of the blind forces of nature, he is no better than an animal and there is no ultimate reason why he should not act out any and every impulse. The century that followed Darwin and Huxley has demonstrated the truth of this to anyone not willfully blind.

In fact, Huxley lived to despise the nihilistic culture that he helped create. Darwin biographer Jacques Barzun said, "He was trying to slay the ghost he had raised, but lacked the formula" (*Darwin, Marx, Wagner*, p. 103).

One evening the flamboyant homosexual Oscar Wilde came to the sixty-year-old Huxley's house with a coterie of his daughter Nettie's "self-obsessed hedonist" artsy friends. Wilde came "with his risque quips," projecting all the "petulances and flippancies of the decadence, the febrile self-assertion, the voluptuousness, the perversity of the new Hedonism" (Desmond, p. 540). Huxley responded, "That man never enters my house again."

Both Darwin and Huxley were faithful husbands and moralists. Neither liked flaming homosexuals and moral decadence, but the divorce plague and homosexual rights and legalized abortion and the pornography revolution are direct products of their evolutionary principles and religious skepticism.

Barzun observed that Huxley's views "left him and his world naked before moral adversity ... and Huxley died heavyhearted with forebodings of the kind of future he had helped to prepare" (*Darwin, Marx, Wagner*, p. 64).

In 1893, Huxley boastingly wrote, "... history records that whenever science and orthodoxy have been fairly opposed, the latter has been forced to retire from the lists, bleeding and crushed if not annihilated; scotched, if not slain."

This was wishful thinking on Huxley's part. In fact, it is "science" that has been proven wrong repeatedly and often wretchedly, whereas the Bible has been vindicated time and again. Huxley built his life on a myth.

Before Huxley died he said he would rather go to hell than be annihilated.

“It is a curious thing that I find my dislike to the thought of extinction increasing as I get older and nearer the goal. It flashes across me at all sorts of times with a sort of horror that in 1900 I shall probably know no more of what is going on than I did in 1800. I had sooner be in hell ... at any rate in one of the upper circles, where the climate and company are not too trying” (Desmond, p. 506).

According to the Bible, Huxley doubtless got his wish to be in hell, since there is no evidence that he ever trusted in Christ, though there are no “upper circles” in that place.

He became increasingly depressed and nihilistic. “A death shroud descended over Huxley’s philosophy” (Desmond, p. 560). He and Darwin believed that mankind was destined to perish in a final “universal winter” when the universe ceased to sustain life.

In her old age, Huxley’s wife Nettie “was lapping on the edges of agnosticism herself” (Desmond, p. 516). This was the result of disobeying God and becoming unequally yoked with an unbeliever (2 Corinthians 6:14). She was plagued by questions such as these: “Do we all just shrivel up? Does destiny lie in some sun? What is the good of it all?” The great questions of life are answered plainly in the Bible, a Book that gives every evidence of being what it claims to be, which is the infallible Word of God. When men and women reject the light of the Bible they are left to wander in gross darkness and confusion. Nothing is worth losing one’s faith over. Jesus wisely asked, “What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?” (Matthew 16:26).

Insanity and Depression

Insanity and depression ran deeply in the skeptical Huxley family.

Huxley's father died in an asylum. His two brothers suffered "extreme mental anxiety" and "near madness."

Thomas himself had many debilitating bouts with deep depression, periods when he was unable to face the world and "a deadness hangs about me." He was said to carry "a strain of madness in him" and to carry on "lengthy conversations between unknown persons living within his brain" (p. 555).

Huxley's daughter Mady was troubled by mental illness for years, "prey to gloom and horrors," before her death in her mid-twenties. She "hardly knew her three-year-old." She died in near-madness and despair, "desperately wanting to believe in another happier world that shall make up for all the cruelties of this" (p. 558). Her own father's philosophy provided no comfort, no purpose, no hope, no salvation.

One of Huxley's grandsons, Noel Trevelyan, committed suicide at age 25 and another, Julian Huxley, suffered six mental breakdowns.

Huxley's Influential Skeptic Grandsons

Two of Huxley's grandsons achieved notoriety in their own right in the promotion of skepticism.

JULIAN HUXLEY, an atheist and a rabid Darwinist, had a tremendous influence through his writings, his work with the British and American Humanist Associations, and as the founder of UNESCO. He wrote,

"There is no separate supernatural realm: all phenomena are part of one natural process of evolution" (*Essays of a Humanist*, 1969).

At the Centennial Celebration of Darwin's *Origin of Species* at the University of Chicago in 1959, Julian gave the keynote speech entitled "The Evolutionary Vision." He said:

"Man's destiny is to be the sole agent for the future evolution of this planet. ... In the evolutionary pattern of thought there is no longer either need or room for the supernatural. The earth was not created, it evolved. So did

all the animals and plants that inhabit it, including our human selves, mind and soul as well as brain and body. So did religion. Evolutionary man can no longer take refuge from his loneliness in the arms of a divinized father figure whom he has himself created, nor escape from the responsibility of making decisions by sheltering under the umbrella of Divine Authority ... **the evolutionary vision is enabling us to discern, however incompletely, the lineaments of the new religion that we can be sure will arise to serve the needs of the coming era**" (S. Tax and C. Callender, *Evolution after Darwin*, Vol. 3, pp. 252-253, 260).

Julian was the first president of the British Humanist Association, which was devoted to "living good lives without religious beliefs." In 2008, this association supported the Atheist Bus Campaign that sponsored banners proclaiming "There's probably no God; now stop worrying and enjoy your life."

Huxley was a co-founder of the American Humanist Association and was a signer of the 1933 *Humanist Manifesto*. Among its 15 statements were the following:

- Religious humanists regard the universe as self-existing and not created.
- Humanism asserts that the nature of the universe depicted by modern science makes unacceptable any supernatural or cosmic guarantees of human values.
- We are convinced that the time has passed for theism, deism, modernism, and the several varieties of "new thought."
- The distinction between the sacred and the secular can no longer be maintained.
- It follows that there will be no uniquely religious emotions and attitudes of the kind hitherto associated with belief in the supernatural.

The *Humanist Manifesto* even called for the control and reconstitution of all religious institutions. Statement # 13 said:

“Religious humanism maintains that all associations and institutions exist for the fulfillment of human life. The intelligent evaluation, transformation, control, and direction of such associations and institutions with a view to the enhancement of human life is the purpose and program of humanism. Certainly **religious institutions, their ritualistic forms, ecclesiastical methods, and communal activities must be reconstituted** as rapidly as experience allows, in order to function effectively in the modern world.”

In promotional literature for the American Humanist Association, Julian Huxley wrote:

“I use the word ‘humanist’ to mean someone who believes that man is just as much a natural phenomenon as an animal or plant; that his body, mind, and soul were not supernaturally created but are products of evolution, and that he is not under the control or guidance of any supernatural being or beings, but has to rely on himself and his own powers” (cited from Henry Morris, *History of Modern Creationism*, p. 81).

Huxley looked upon humanism as a religion and wrote a book entitled “Religion without Revelation.”

Huxley used his position as first Director-General of UNESCO (the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization) to call for a one-world religion and a one-world government. In “A New World Vision,” which Huxley wrote in 1946 as his vision for UNESCO, he said:

“Thus the general philosophy of UNESCO should, it seems, be a scientific world humanism, global in extent and evolutionary in background.”

“The unifying of traditions into a single common pool of experience, awareness and purpose is the necessary prerequisite for further major progress in human evolution. Accordingly, although political unification in some sort of world government will be required for the definitive attainment of this state, unification in the

things of the mind is not only necessary also, but it can pave the way for other types of unification.”

True to his philosophy that there is no divine basis for morality, Julian Huxley practiced “open marriage.”

Julian was also a racist and a eugenicist. He was convinced that society must “prevent the deterioration of quality of racial stock” (Huxley, *Essays in Popular Science*, 1926).

In 1947, Huxley said that the less desirable among mankind should not have easy access to relief or treatment:

“The lowest strata are reproducing too fast. Therefore ... they must not have too easy access to relief or hospital treatment lest the removal of the last check on natural selection should make it too easy for children to be produced or to survive; long unemployment should be a ground for sterilisation” (Huxley, *Man in the Modern World*, 1947).

ALDOUS HUXLEY (1894-1963), another one of Thomas’s grandsons, was a mystic who believed that he was enlightened through drug use.

As a young man he “discarded dogmatic religion altogether” (Anne Bancroft, *Twentieth-Century Mystics and Sages*, p. 8).

He leapt from one mystical path to another “like a grasshopper.” He studied hypnosis, psychic phenomena, meditation, automatic writing, and other things, but he was particularly drawn to Hinduism and Buddhism.

In the 1930s, while studying Vedantic Hinduism under the direction of Gerald Heard, the founder of Trabusco College in California, Huxley wrote *The Perennial Philosophy*. In this he discussed the teachings of various mystics and described his religious views at that time. He said they were based “on direct experience,” which is the mystical approach. But it was in 1952 when Huxley claimed to have finally achieved enlightenment. This was through the ingestion of mescaline. He said that this experience cleansed the “doors of

perception.” He continued to use drugs, including LSD, to the end of his life. On his deathbed his wife gave him LSD and sat beside him reading the occultic *Tibetan Book of the Dead*.

In his books *The Doors of Perception* and *Heaven and Hell*, Huxley described his drug experiences in terms of spiritual enlightenment. He thought that the brain acted as a filter or a “reducing valve” that did not allow man to readily connect with the pantheistic “mind at large.” Through drugs, yoga, and ascetic practices the brain’s filtering function was weakened, allowing the individual to tap into the “truth.”

Huxley has had a great influence on rock & roll and on the modern world at large. The 60s rock group The Doors were named after his doctrine. They, too, used drugs as a door to “another world,” to “break on through to the other side.”

Huxley was associated with the Esalen Institute and had an influence on the Human Potential field that exploded in the 70s and 80s.

Ernst Haeckel

Darwin's German Apostle

Ernst Haeckel (1834-1919) promoted Darwinism enthusiastically in Germany and elsewhere in Europe. He met Darwin three times and nearly worshipped the man.

Though modern evolutionists outside of Germany have largely distanced themselves from Haeckel, his theories and charts continue to influence students of evolution to this day.

Haeckel has been called “one of the most influential and controversial thinkers of his time” (Mario Gregorio, *From Here to Eternity*, p. 26).

His scientific writings sold in the hundreds of thousands and were translated into 25 languages. Richard Weikart says they were “probably the most popular nonfiction books in Germany” in that day (*From Darwin to Hitler*, p. 24).

In the March 2000 issue of *Natural History* Stephen Jay Gould stated,

“Haeckel’s forceful, eminently comprehensible, if not always accurate, books appeared in all major languages and **surely exerted more influence than the works of any other scientist, including Darwin ... in convincing people throughout the world about the validity of evolution.**”

In 1921, physiologist Max Verworn said,

“One can state without exaggeration that **no scientist has exercised a greater influence on the development of our contemporary worldview than Haeckel**” (*From Darwin to Hitler*, p. 11).

Richard Goldschmidt, a leading geneticist of the twentieth century, was one of countless individuals influenced by Haeckel. He described the effect that Haeckel’s book *Natural History of Creation* had on him at age 16:

“It seemed that all problems of heaven and earth were solved simply and convincingly; there was an answer to every question which troubled the young mind. Evolution was the key to everything and could replace all the beliefs and creeds which one was discarding. There were no creation, no God, no heaven and hell, only evolution and the wonderful law of recapitulation which demonstrated the fact of evolution to the most stubborn believer in creation. I was so fascinated and shaken up that I had to communicate to others my new knowledge, and this was done in the schoolyard, on school picnics, and among friends. I remember vividly a scene during a school picnic when I stood surrounded by a group of schoolboys to whom I expounded the gospel of Darwinism as Haeckel saw it” (Goldschmidt, *Portraits from Memory*, p. 34).

Born into a liberal Christian home, Haeckel became an evolutionist while studying medicine, but it was theological modernism that paved the way. His parents “were deeply religious, yet with a liberal inclination” (Gregorio, p. 26). In particular, they were influenced by Friedrich Schleiermacher, who died the year that Ernst was born. Schleiermacher paved the way for Darwinian evolution by replacing the authority of an infallible Bible with that of human intuition and feeling. He reconciled humanistic philosophy with the Bible by downgrading the Bible to a separate, mythical level of reality. “In his separation of the intellectual content of Christianity (the objective biblical revelation) from Christian ‘feeling,’ Schleiermacher seemed to provide a means whereby the essence of Christianity could remain unaffected, no matter how much of the Bible was rejected” (Ian Murray, *Evangelicalism Divided*, p. 11).

Schleiermacher was wrong. Once the Bible’s historicity is placed in doubt, its authority is destroyed. True Christian faith is based on a revelation from God (Romans 10:17), a revelation that claims to be divinely inspired (2 Timothy 3:16-17), the historical foundation of which are said to be

“infallible proofs” (Acts 1:3). If that revelation is not factually accurate, the Christian faith is blind and non-sustainable.

Schleiermacher further paved the way for Darwinianism through his pantheistic view of God. He replaced the personal Creator God of Scripture with a vague “first cause.” He wrote, “There is no God without the world, no world without God” (Gregorio, p. 27). This “God” could easily be thought of as a god who created through billions of years of evolution.

Heresy and pagan philosophy was in the air in Germany in that day and Haeckel imbibed deeply of it. He learned of evolution before he ever heard of Charles Darwin.

Haeckel was influenced, for example, by the philosophy of Johann Wolfgang Goethe. He first encountered Goethe in a book by Matthias Schleiden given to him by his parents as a Christmas gift. Schleiden presented an evolutionary view of life progress from simple to complex and placed a quote from Goethe at the beginning of each chapter. Haeckel later followed that practice in one of his books. Goethe taught the transmutation of species as early as 1796.

“... all the more perfected organic natural types, among which we view fishes, amphibians, birds, mammals and at the pinnacle of the latter, man, are formed according to a single archetype that only deviates around its very constant parts to a greater or lesser degree, and develops and reorganises itself on a daily basis through reproduction” (cited from Gregorio, *From Here to Eternity*, p. 147).

Haeckel was also influenced by men such as Bernhard von Cotta, a geologist who taught evolution from “the simplest organic cell to the human species,” and Friedrich Humboldt, who taught “virtually every corner stone in Haeckel’s system.” And there were others.

In spite of this unwholesome intellectual diet, at age 20 Haeckel still held to a semblance of Christian faith. In a “Penitential sermon of a 20-year-old boy to himself,” he

exhorted himself to “hold fast to the most steadfast faith in God,” to have confidence in “his miraculous loving-kindness,” and to “confide in God; he will save you and guide you.”

Sadly, Haeckel did not go to the Bible and to the Christ of the Bible for this faith in God but instead tried to maintain a Christian faith divorced from an infallibly divine Revelation. In fact, he hated orthodox Lutheranism with its “Scripture alone” dogma.

This weak reed could not sustain, and it is not surprising that Haeckel’s life was transformed during his postgraduate studies by reading Darwin’s *On the Origin of Species*, which had been published in German in 1860.

“As he explained in a letter to his mistress, written in his waning years, he began as a Christian but when he started to practice medicine and penetrate the mysteries of life and its evolution, he became--after the most desperate spiritual conflict--a free-thinker and pantheist” (Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 180).

After obtaining his doctorate, he took a teaching position at Jena University and remained there for nearly 50 years.

Called “the gadfly of Jena,” Haeckel was morally loose. He had many mistresses. In 1898, when he was 64 and his first wife was an invalid, he began a five-year adulterous affair with a woman 34 years his junior. His paramour beat him to the grave, committing suicide at age 35.

Haeckel’s daughter, Emma, had to be committed to a mental institution for the final part of her life.

Haeckel determined that man is the product of blind chance. He said that “**man himself is but a tiny grain of protoplasm in the perishable framework of organic nature**” (*The Riddle of the Universe*, New York: Harper, 1900, p. 14).

If this is true, and it is true if naturalistic evolution is correct, it means that there is no purpose to life and everything is the result of chance, even man’s thoughts and

deductions. It means that it does not ultimately matter what man believes or how he lives. No wonder that Haeckel wrote to his father in 1864, "Personal individual existence appears to me so horribly miserable, petty, and worthless, that I see it as intended for nothing but for destruction" (*From Darwin to Hitler*, p. 76).

Haeckel rejected the God of the Bible, the divine inspiration of Scripture, the fall of man, heaven, and hell, and the deity, virgin birth, sinlessness, blood atonement, and bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Haeckel said,

"For me the value of Darwin is that the human no longer needs to have a supernatural soul, and that one no longer needs purpose to explain creation" (Richard Weikart, *From Darwin to Hitler*, p. 26).

Haeckel became a great blasphemer, calling the Creator God of Scripture "a gaseous Vertebrate."

Haeckel's god was nature. He was the inventor of the term "ecology," and he believed in a sort of metaphysical power in nature that he called Monism. He wrote, "We are compelled by reflection to recognize that God is not to be placed against the material world [as in Christianity], but must be placed as a 'divine power' or 'moving spirit' within the cosmos itself" (Haeckel, *Monism: The Confession of Faith of a Man of Science*, London: Adam and Charles Black, 1895, p. 15). This is pagan panentheism, wherein God is in everything.

Haeckel believed that the religion of nature would destroy Christianity and envisioned a time when churches would become places of nature worship. He envisioned the enthroning of Urania or Venus, the Greek goddess of astrology, love and beauty, in the place of Jesus Christ.

"The religious service of the Sunday, which will continue as the ancient day of rest, of edification and relaxation that follows the six workdays of the working week, will undergo an essential improvement in the monistic

church. The mystical belief in supernatural miracles will be replaced by clear knowledge of the true miracles of nature. The temples of God as places of devotion will not be adorned with images of saints and crucifixes, but with richly artistic representations from the inexhaustible realms of beauty of natural and human life. Between the high columns of the Gothic cathedrals, which have climbing plants winding around them, slender palms and tree-ferns, graceful banana trees and bamboos, will remind us of the creative powers of the tropics. In great aquaria below the church windows, delightful jellyfish and siphonophores, brightly colored corals and starfish, will elucidate the art-forms of marine life. In place of the high altar there will be a statue of Urania, which will represent the omnipotence of the law of matter through the movements of the planets” (Haeckel, *Die Weltratsel: Gemeinverständliche Studien über Monistische Philosophie*, 1901, pp. 462-63, quoted from *Hitler and the Germans* by Eric Voegelin and Brenden Purcell, p. 126).

Known as “Darwin’s Bulldog on the Continent,” Haeckel “became Darwin’s chief European apostle, proclaiming the gospel of evolution with evangelistic fervor, not only to the university intelligentsia but also to the common man through popular books and lectures in rented halls.”

Haeckel set up elaborate displays for his lectures, with all sorts of skeletons, fascinating drawings and charts, many of them fanciful and others out-and-out deceptive.

Haeckel’s Racism

Haeckel believed that man evolved from apes and that some “races” are less evolved.

He wrote, “New perfect races arise continually and improve themselves in the struggle for existence, while the imperfect races, just as frequently as they drive out the old root-forms, die out and become extinct” (Di Gregorio, p. 90). He said the “lower races of men ... remind us of our animal ancestors, and ... seem to manifest a closer connection with

the gorilla and chimpanzee of that region than with a Kant or Goethe" (p. 246). He said the tribes of South Africa "have remained, down to the present day, at the lowest stage of human development, and made the smallest advance beyond the ape" (p. 247).

Some of Haeckel's charts depicted the supposed evolution of modern man from the lower "race" (Negroid) to the higher (Caucasians, and especially, of course, Germans). He strongly believed in racial superiority, considering it a natural product of evolution. Haeckel wrote,

"Between the most highly developed animal soul and the least developed human soul there exists only a small quantitative, but no qualitative difference, and that this difference is much less, than the difference between the lowest and the highest human souls, or as the difference between the highest and lowest animal souls" (*The Natural History of Creation*, 1868).

He divided man into two "species" -- the straight-haired and the wooly-haired. He looked upon Australian aborigines as closer to apes or even dogs in their reasoning faculties than to the "higher humans." Haeckel said that since the "wooly-haired" are "psychologically nearer to the mammals than to civilized Europeans, we must, therefore, assign a totally different value to their lives" (Robert Lifton, *The Nazi Doctor*, p. 125).

Haeckel made a drawing of a tree populated by a gorilla, an orangutan, a chimpanzee, and a Negro.

In *The Natural History of Creation*, Haeckel featured a series of 12 drawings depicting the alleged evolution of man from ape to Greek. There are six apes and six men. The highest ape looks much like the lowest man, who is some sort of African black man or an Australian aboriginal. The drawings are heavily modified, in that the apes are given more human features, while the "lower" humans are given more ape-like features.

Haeckel held that “the lower species of men” are of little value. “The value of life of these lower wild peoples is equal to that of the anthropoid apes or stands only slightly above them” (*From Darwin to Hitler*, p. 109). As Richard Weikart observes, “Haeckel’s devaluing of ‘primitive’ races, by placing them on par with animals, would be the first step toward a genocidal mentality” (*From Darwin to Hitler*, p. 110).

Modern evolutionists are quick to distance themselves from the racism that was rampant among early Darwinians, but if evolution is true then racism would also have a scientific basis. Why would all evolved men be equal? Why wouldn’t some be more recently and more highly evolved? It is only the Bible’s doctrine of divine creation, which says men are made in the image of God, that gives men real equality and refutes racism. Creation teaches us that all men and women are children of the same father, Adam, and he was not an ape!

Haeckel’s Culture of Death

Haeckel argued that as evolution, supposedly, rewards the “fittest,” man should help evolution along by eliminating the unfit. He wrote:

“The cruel and unsparing ‘struggle for existence,’ which rages--and naturally must rage--everywhere in the biosphere, this unceasing and inexorable competition of all living creatures, is an undeniable fact; only the chosen minority of the privileged fit ones in the condition to survive successfully this competition, while the great majority of the competitors must necessarily perish miserably” (Richard Weikart, *From Darwin to Hitler*, p. 80).

In *The Natural History of Creation*, 1870, Haeckel praised the Spartans, because they practiced euthanasia of imperfect babies in order to create the superior man. Later “he confessed that he had indeed supported infanticide in his earlier book” (Weikart, p. 146). Killing of the unfit was, in his

estimation, the logical consequence of Darwinian survival of the fittest.

Haeckel promoted abortion, infanticide, and euthanasia for the “inferior” and the infirm. He proposed “a dose of some painless and rapid poison” to do away with the “hundreds of thousands of incurables--lunatics, lepers, people with cancer, etc.” (Weikart, pp. 118, 119). Haeckel proposed that euthanasia program that would be “under the control of an authoritative commission” (p. 119).

Hitler took Haeckel’s Darwinian philosophy to the most radical conclusion, euthanizing millions of “inferiors” and forcefully sterilizing millions more.

Haeckel gave impetus to the abortion movement by teaching that the embryo is still in the evolutionary stage and not fully human. Even the newborn child, according to Haeckel, “not only possesses no consciousness and no reason, but is also dumb and only gradually develops the activity of the senses and of the mind” (Weikart, p. 147). Haeckel believed that the newborn infant has no soul and therefore “the destruction of abnormal new born infants cannot rationally be classed as murder” (Haeckel, *The Wonders of Life*, 1904, p. 21).

For the mentally handicapped, he recommended “a small dose of morphine or cyanide” to “free this pitiable creature” from itself as well as from being a burden on its caretakers (ibid).

Since Haeckel believed that man does not have an eternal soul, human life was considered no more significant than that of an animal. He wrote, “... we have the right--or if one prefers--the duty, to end the deep suffering of our fellow humans, if strong illness without hope of recovery makes their existence unbearable and if they themselves ask us for ‘redemption from evil’” (*From Darwin to Hitler*, p. 148).

“Not only did Haeckel justify infanticide, abortion, and assisted suicide or voluntary euthanasia, but he also supported the involuntary killing of the mentally ill. He

condemned the idea that all human life should be preserved, 'even when it is totally worthless.' ... He complained that not only are many mentally ill people burdens to society, but so are lepers, cancer patients, and others with incurable illnesses. Why not just spare ourselves much pain and money, he asked, by just giving them a shot of morphine? ... The leading Darwinist in Germany thus gave his scientific imprimatur to murdering the disabled, both in infancy and in adulthood" (Weikart, p. 148).

Haeckel wanted to raise the German people to the status of a superior race, purified of the blood of the unfit. His disciple Alexander Tille said that their goal was "the elevation and more excellent formation of the human race," and this would require a two-fold program: "careful selection of the best" and "merciless elimination of the worst" (Weikart, p. 45).

Hitler carried this program forth with a vengeance. His book *Mein Kampf* ("My Struggle") presented his vision for "survival of the fittest" toward the perfection of the human race. There he proposed "a ruthless determination to prune away all excrescences which are incapable of being improved." These *excrescences* were identified as "mongrels and negroids." His vision was that this struggle of purification would "lead the race through stages of sustained reciprocal education towards a higher type, until finally the best portion of mankind will possess the earth."

Hitler's deputy Rudolph Hess said that "National Socialism is nothing but applied biology" (Robert Lifton, *The Nazi Doctors*, p. 31).

Haeckel's culture of death did not end with the collapse of Hitler's Nazi regime. It has made tremendous strides since then.

As for the association between Darwinism and this culture, Richard Weikart observes,

"... even though not all Darwinists and eugenicists went along with Haeckel's program of 'rational' extermination of the disabled, it is striking that the vast majority of those

who did press for abortion, infanticide, and euthanasia in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were fervent proponents of a naturalistic Darwinian worldview” (*From Darwin to Hitler*, p. 149).

Haeckel’s Embryo Chart and the Law of Recapitulation

It was Haeckel who devised the iconic embryo chart “proving” that at the embryonic stage man looks almost exactly like various types of embryonic animals.

He based this on the “law of recapitulation” (also called *the biogenetic law*) which stated that the human embryo goes through an evolutionary cycle during which it resembles a single-celled marine organism, then a worm, then a fish with gill slits, then a monkey with a tail, and finally a human. According to recapitulation, each creature repeats or recapitulates the entire alleged evolutionary history. Thus, the human embryo passes along through various stages from a single cell to a fish to an amphibian to a reptile to a mammal to an ape to a human. Supposedly, as evolutionary progress is made by a certain creature, new stages are added to its embryonic growth.

Haeckel summarized this “law” with the saying “ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny.” Ontogeny refers to the growth of the embryo, whereas phylogeny refers to evolutionary history.

Haeckel’s embryo chart first appeared in print in 1866 in his book *Generelle Morphologie der Organismen* and in 1868 in the book *The Natural History of Creation*, and since then it has been republished in various forms in countless textbooks, journals, popular reports, and museums. It is still appearing in textbooks in the early 21st century. One teacher said, “I have taught Jr. High Science for over 35 years. Every textbook from every major publisher I have ever seen has had Haeckel’s embryos pictured and the text usually claims this as a proof for evolution” (<http://creation.com/fraud-rediscovered>).

The problem is that it is a grand scientific fraud, and it has been known by scientists to be a fraud since the 19th century!

We have documented this in the section of this book on “Icons of Evolution.”

Haeckel’s Monera and Huxley’s *Bathybius Haeckelii*

Ernst Haeckel wasn’t satisfied to fabricate an influential embryo chart and thus deceive multitudes of people. He also invented a substance called “Monera” or “Urschleim” (primordial slime) to fit into his evolutionary “family tree” as the missing link between animate and inanimate matter.

In *The History of Creation* (1868), Haeckel included a series of drawings showing the actual appearance, eating habits, and reproductive cycle of the mythical Monera. He said, “[They are] not composed of any organs at all, but consist entirely of shapeless, simple homogeneous matter ... nothing more than a shapeless, mobile, little lump of mucus or slime, consisting of albuminous combinations of carbon,” and, “organisms without organs, which in their perfectly developed condition form a freely moving, naked, perfectly structureless and homogeneous mass of sarcode (Protoplasm).”

Monera, which are supposed to form “spontaneously” on the ocean floor, were thought to give rise to all other organisms “through the course of time through differentiation and natural selection in the struggle for existence” (Gregorio, *From Here to Eternity*, p. 138).

Haeckel even gave the Monera the scientific name *Protamoeba primitivia*.

Understand that Haeckel did not present Monera as mere hypothesis. He presented it as scientific reality. As Russell Grigg observes, “The extent of the detail is the measure of his fraud, as the Monera did not then and do not now exist!” (“Ernst Haeckel: Evangelist for Evolution and Apostle of Deceit,” Creation.com).

Following is an account of this amazing story:

“He imaginatively made up the names of organisms that he thought should exist and was not beyond cheating just

a little if the facts of nature did not fit his theories. Recognizing that there was a gap at the base of the family tree, a vital transition missing between the inorganic non-living matter and the first sign of organic life, Haeckel invented a series of minute organisms he called the Monera to fill it. He published details of the various kinds of Monera, with drawings of these shapeless blobs of protoplasm without nuclei that he said reproduced by a process of fission.

“At the time of his writing, in 1868, not even a hint of the Monera had been found, but, coincidentally, later that same year Thomas Huxley, working in England, reported finding some microscopic organisms in mud samples dredged up from the depths of the North Atlantic. These small organisms appeared to be a very primitive form of organized life, although the samples had been preserved in strong alcohol so that they were not alive. Huxley recognized these organisms as Haeckel’s Monera and proposed to call the particular species he had discovered *Bathybius haeckelii* in honor of the professor at the University of Jena.

“Nothing better could happen to a natural scientist than to have his name Latinized and appended to some creature, no matter how lowly. His fame spread, aided perhaps by the prophetic qualities that were flatteringly ascribed to his many other talents. Throughout the 1870s *HMS Challenger* continued to dredge up samples of mud containing *B. haeckelii*, thus confirming Haeckel’s prediction and Huxley’s observation. Meanwhile, great publicity was made of this since it implied abiogenesis and was urgently needed to prop up Darwin’s theory. Many, perhaps wavering in their faith in divine creation, at last capitulated to science when confronted with *B. haeckelii*. From the *HMS Challenger* work, Huxley confidently said that the *Bathybius*, this life in the making, ‘probably forms one continuous scum of living matter ... on the sea bed ... girding the whole surface of the earth.’

“It was customary practice at that time for living samples to be preserved for later examination by dropping them into a specimen jar of strong alcohol. This was done in a routine manner to the mud samples on board the *HMS Challenger*, but a chemist on the expedition, who seems to have been more committed to his chemistry than to biology, pointed out that the protoplasmic matter recognized as *B. HAECKELII* WAS NOTHING MORE THAN AN AMORPHOUS PRECIPITATE OF SULPHATE OF LIME (GYPSUM) WHICH FORMS WHEN SEAWATER IS ADDED TO ALCOHOL!

“The date was 1875 and that should have been the end of *B. haeckelii*, then and there, but **it was vitally important that those promoting the theory of evolution, not lose the public confidence by exposure of this fiasco.** Scientists were defending their authority as the Roman Church leaders had their authority in the face of Galileo’s discoveries. The matter was reported somewhat obscurely in the *Quarterly Journal of the Microscopical Science* and at the Royal Society of London the following year, but no public comment was made on the significance of this discovery. The author is indebted to Rupke for scanning all the English and European journals of the day to find only one article, and that in French, which critically discusses **the way the public had been misled over the question of Monera.**

“One may well wonder how such a grand cover-up was possible. It is not difficult to surmise how when something of the conspiratorial nature of nineteenth century British science, with T.H. Huxley as the grand master, is understood. It has been exposed by Irving (1955) and by Bibby (1972). The latter describes how Huxley formed the X-Club in 1864--the members could never agree on a name--and it consisted of nine members who, with one exception, were all presidents and secretaries of learned societies; the one exception was Herbert Spencer... These nine were men at the top of their profession, hand picked for their views, and holding

personal influence on almost every famous scientist in the world, as well as on many distinguished radicals. The members met for dinner always immediately before each meeting of the Royal Society, at which time strategy was plotted. By this means, British science was literally ‘governed’, from 1864 until 1884, by Huxley and his disciples, and, with their combined influence over the scientific press **it was little wonder that the 1876 report of the demise of Huxley’s *B. haeckelii* was never made public**” (Ian Taylor, *In the Mind of Man*, pp. 182-185).

True to character, Haeckel did not apologize publicly for his gross error. In fact, he did not even pull the myth from his book! Haeckel’s *History* continued to be widely circulated--complete with the unrevised account of the mythical Monera--for another half century both in English and German and continued to wield an influence.

We see, then, that the enthusiastic evolutionists Ernst Haeckel and Thomas Huxley had the same amazing powers as Percival Lowell. Whereas Lowell saw canals, Haeckel and Huxley saw Monera.

Haeckel’s Evolutionary Tree

Ernst Haeckel was the inventor of the evolutionary “family tree,” and this was probably his most lasting and influential creation.

Haeckel’s “family tree” depicted all of life as a single tree with the mythical “Moneren” at the bottom of the trunk and “Menschen” (people) at the top. (Haeckel was apparently the first to alliterate the evolutionary scale.) Life supposedly progressed from moneren to amoeba to fish to amphibian to reptile to mammals to man. This is the trunk of the tree, and the various types of creatures within the major categories allegedly branched off in various directions as evolution took its blind twists and turns.

Though modern evolutionists would not agree with Haeckel about the details of the “family tree,” they do believe

in “particle to people” evolution. They do believe that every living thing began as some sort of “monera.”

But the evolutionary “family tree” is fictional. From a purely physical standpoint, we know today that every living thing is built by its amazing DNA code. To evolve from non-life to life would require the “creation” of the self-replicating cell from nothing by pure chance. It would indeed require some sort of “monera” that appeared mysteriously from non-life. And if that were to happen, by some incredible act of chance, it would then require that this self-replicating cell not only live and prosper in its un-designed, happenstance environment, but also develop into all of the myriad and most wonderful life forms that exist on earth. (It would also require that every plant life, from the tiniest blade of grass to the mighty Sequoia, would have followed the same blind path, in order to provide food and shelter and other necessities to the living creatures.)

This would require adding mind-boggling amounts of genetic information. From nothing. By pure blind chance. With no objective. Without any intelligent input.

Though evolutionists usually pretend that they don’t believe in miracles, in fact, every step of their “family tree” would have been “miraculous.”

The evolutionary “family tree” is also disproven by the fossil record.

In the last chapter of *Evolution: The Fossils Still Say No*, Dr. Duane Gish gives many quotations from evolutionary scientists that the fossil record disproves the doctrine of Darwinian evolution. Consider the following:

“Unfortunately, the origins of most higher categories are shrouded in mystery: commonly new higher categories appear abruptly in the fossil record without evidence of transitional forms” (D. M. Raup and S. M. Stanley, *Principles of Paleontology*, 1971, p. 306).

“There has been no steady progress in the higher development of organic design. We have had, instead, vast

stretches of little or no change and one evolutionary burst that created the whole system” (D. B. Kitts, *Evolution*, 28:467, 1974).

“We are forced to the conclusion that most of the really novel taxa that appear suddenly in the fossil record did in fact originate suddenly” (F. J. Ayala and J. W. Valentine, *Evolving: The Theory and Process of Organic Evolution*, 1979, p. 267).

“The evidence we find in the geologic record is not nearly as compatible with Darwinian natural selection as we would like it to be. Darwin was completely aware of this. He was embarrassed by the fossil record because it didn’t look the way he predicted it would ... Well, 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, WE HAVE EVEN FEWER EXAMPLES OF EVOLUTIONARY TRANSITION THAN WE HAD IN DARWIN’S TIME. By this I mean that 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” (D. M. Raup, *Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin*, 50:22, January 1979).

“But fossil species remain unchanged throughout most of their history and the record fails to contain a single example of a significant transition” (D. S. Woodruff, *Science*, 208:716, 1980).

“Missing links in the sequence of fossil evidence were a worry to Darwin. He felt sure they would eventually turn up, but they are still missing and seem likely to remain so” (E.R. Leach, *Nature*, 293:19, 1981).

In 1981, Colin Patterson, a senior paleontologist at the British Museum of Natural History, made the following admission about Haeckel’s “family tree.”

“We have access to the tips of the tree; the tree itself is theory, and people who pretend to know about the tree and to describe what went on it--how the branches came off and the twigs came off--ARE, I THINK, TELLING STORIES” (Brian Leith, *The Listener*, BBC, 106:390, 1981).

According to this highly educated and well-placed evolutionary scientist, those who claim that the fossil record exhibits the “missing links” are “telling stories.” And these aren’t innocent “bedtime stories”!

Four years earlier, in another moment of great evolutionary candor, Harvard professor Stephen Jay Gould made the following amazing admission:

“The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as THE TRADE SECRET OF PALEONTOLOGY. The evolutionary trees that adorn our textbooks have data only at the tips and nodes of their branches, and the rest is inference, however, reasonable, not the evidence of fossils” (Natural History magazine, 86(5): 13, 1977, cited from Duane Gish, *The Fossils Still Say No*, p. 346).

A trade secret is something that is kept hidden from the public. To withhold evidence is not honest and it is NOT TRUE SCIENCE.

Modernized editions of Haeckel’s “family tree” still appear in science textbooks.

Haeckel’s Dumb Ape-Man

Ernst Haeckel had an incredible imagination and should have been a science fiction writer instead of pretending to be a scientist. Actually, what he did was help turn science into science fiction.

Haeckel not only devised Monera and family trees, phony laws and modified embryos, he even devised an entire race of ape-men. Reasoning that the major difference between man and ape is the former’s ability to talk, and assuming that

evolution is true and that man evolved from animals, Haeckel concluded that man's predecessor was a dumb ape-man. He even invented a scientific name for this mythical creature: *Pithecanthropus alalus* ("speechless ape-man").

Haeckel had an artist, Gabriel Max, draw the fabled creature, and Max depicted an entire *Pithecanthropus* family. The pot-bellied father, ape-headed but having an atypically hairy human body, stands upright and leans on a thick branch, looking as stupid as stupid can be. The dim-witted-looking mother sits cross-legged nursing a poor little ape-man baby. She has long-straggly hair but is less ape-looking than her "husband" except for her ape-like feet.

In every detail, this drawing represents a fabricated myth that was created in an attempt to discredit the Bible and prove evolution true.

As we will see, Java Man was supposed to be the evidence for *Pithecanthropus alalus*, but it failed and there is no more evidence today that such creatures existed as there was when Gabriel Max painted Haeckel's "speechless ape-man."

Icons of Evolution

“It must be significant that nearly all the evolutionary stories I learned as a student, from Trueman’s *Ostrea/Gryphea* to Carruther’s *Zaphrentis delanouei*, have now been ‘debunked’”
(Derek Ager, professor of Geology at Swansea, Wales, and an evolutionist).

Kenneth Poppe, a career biology instructor who has taught science in public school classrooms for 30 years, says,

“I have never seen a biology textbook that did not examine a few of the old-time scientific myths and superstitions that have since been debunked” (*Reclaiming Science from Darwinism*, 2006, p. 27).

In 2010, I examined five high school textbooks and found that each one used debunked icons--such as the peppered moth, the horse chart, the four-winged fruit fly, and the embryo chart.

The fact that the following icons are used in textbooks and museums without admitting that some have been debunked and that there are serious problems with the others even from an evolutionary perspective proves the “science” is not the objective. As Ian Taylor, an engineer, says:

“Darwin’s theory of evolution has, in many minds, displaced the biblical Creation account of our origins, and to those who hold to this view it is vitally important to maintain whatever evidence there is, at least until sufficient better evidence can be found to replace it. To abandon discredited interpretations without replacement could place the theory of evolution in the perilous position of not being supported by any evidence whatsoever and incur the risk of having the creation account reintroduced. For this same reason, there is an extreme reluctance on the part of the scientific

community to accept or even consider new evidence that does not support the current evolutionary dogma” (*In the Minds of Men*).

We will begin our examination of the major icons of evolution with natural selection and beneficial mutations, for these form the foundation of the “Neo-Darwinian School” (also called the “modern synthesis”) that has held sway since the 1940s. Darwin proposed natural selection as the major driving force of evolution, but as the 20th century progressed and there was an explosion of knowledge about genetics, it became evident that evolution requires an increase of genetic information. How could this occur? It was proposed that the answer lies in mutations. Thus, Neo-Darwinism says that evolution is driven by natural selection acting on genetic mutations.

The British Museum of Natural History’s web site says:

“Natural selection is a critical aspect of the evolutionary process, but it is not the whole story. Evolution depends on there being a diversity of living things for natural selection to act on. The force that creates this diversity is called mutation. Mutations are random alterations in our genes, the result of genes failing to copy themselves properly or exposure to radiation or other chemicals (called mutagens)” (“How Does Evolution Work?” www.nhm.ac.uk).

(Many of the following Icons of Evolution are subjects of professional PowerPoint/Keynote presentations in the apologetics course *An Unshakeable Faith*, which is available from Way of Life Literature.)

Natural Selection

Natural selection is a concept developed in Charles Darwin’s *On the Origin of Species* as the major mechanism of evolution. It is considered to be Darwin’s most brilliant discovery.

In Darwinian terms, natural selection refers to “survival of the fittest.” It says that traits that improve a creature’s chance for survival are preserved for future generations, and in this way small beneficial changes direct evolution. Over millions of years tiny changes produce new structures and new creatures. Darwin called this “descent with modification.”

For example, a drought on the Galapagos Islands in 1977 caused a shortage of small seeds which finches prefer and they were forced to eat larger and tougher ones. In one generation the average size of the birds increased slightly because the smaller ones did not survive. Only the “fittest” survived, and according to Darwinism this slight environment-induced change would eventually produce not only different types of birds but also different types of creatures.

Darwin, a pigeon breeder, used artificial selection to prove natural selection. Through selective breeding techniques an amazing variety of pigeons have been produced, including ones with tail feathers that fan out like a peacock’s, hooded pigeons, hen-shaped pigeons, beautiful multi-colored pigeons, even owl-like pigeons.

To Darwin, the breeding experiments are evidence that environmental pressures can produce the same type of change through “natural selection” and that eventually the accumulation of small changes over great periods of time would produce new limbs, organs, and creatures.

It is important to understand that Darwin emphasized the word “natural.” Darwin rejected any idea of design by an outside intelligence. He said, “There seems to be no more design in the variability of organic beings and the action of natural selection, than in the course which the wind blows” (*Autobiography*).

Darwin’s objective was to provide a mechanism to explain life apart from God. The fierce debate today between Darwinian evolutionists and proponents of Intelligent Design prove this. Any hint that there might be an intelligent

designer involved in life makes establishment Darwinists fighting mad and has resulted in the blacklisting of fellow scientists who dare to question whether purely naturalistic processes can explain the origin of life. Evolutionists in America have even argued this point before the Supreme Court. The National Academy of Sciences told the court that the basic characteristic of modern science is “reliance upon naturalistic explanations.”

It is, therefore, a fundamental fact that Darwinian natural selection is a blind, non-intelligent process.

Consider the following statements by prominent Darwinists:

Darwinism is the “theory of random, purposeless variations acted on by blind, purposeless natural selection” (Douglas Futuyma, *Evolutionary Biology* textbook).

“Natural selection, the blind, unconscious, automatic process which Darwin discovered, and which we now know is the explanation for the existence and apparently purposeful form of all life, has no purpose in mind and no mind’s eye. It does not plan for the future. It has no vision, no foresight, no sight at all. If it can be said to play the role of watchmaker in nature, it is the blind watchmaker” (Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, p. 5).

“If the history of life teaches us any lesson, it is that human beings arose as a kind of glorious accident ... surely a kind of glorious cosmic accident resulting from the catenation [linking] of thousands of improbable events” (Stephen Jay Gould, April 22, 1984, *60 Minutes* television program).

“Man is the result of a purposeless and natural process that did not have him in mind” (George Gaylord Simpson, *The Meaning of Evolution*, 1949, p. 344).

“Science has no need of purpose ... all the extraordinary, wonderful richness of the world can be expressed as

growth from the dunghill of purposeless interconnected corruption” (Peter Atkins, cited from T. Schick Jr., *Readings in the Philosophy of Science*, p. 351).

Darwinists must, therefore, explain how their processes work without regard to any type of intelligence or design, which, as we will see, puts them into a serious quandary.

A century and a half after the publication of *On the Origin of Species*, natural selection remains the major mechanism of evolution. Stuart Kauffman says, “Biologists now tend to believe profoundly that natural selection is the invisible hand that crafts well-wrought forms. ... If current biology has a central canon, you have now heard it” (*At Home in the Universe: The Search for the Laws of Self-organization and Complexity*, 1995).

In answering Darwinian natural selection, we observe:

1. Natural selection can only explain minor variations within a species.

Natural selection might explain something like the size of a finch’s beak, but it has never proven to be a mechanism for the supposed transmigration of species.

Though Charles Darwin titled his book *On the Origin of Species*, in reality he did not give *any* evidence of how one type of animal could evolve into another. His evidence only demonstrated that there can be variety within one kind of animal.

The change in the size of a finch’s beak is interesting, but no matter what size of beak it has, it remains a finch. The same is true for the change in the color of the peppered moth. It is still a moth; in fact it is still a peppered moth. Centuries of pigeon breeding experiments have never produced anything other than pigeons.

A recent example of the type of minor change that is offered as evidence of evolution is the apple maggot. This example is found under the evidence section of the British Natural History Museum’s web site.

“One example of evolution in recent history is that of the apple maggot in North America. Apple maggots, as their name suggests, eat apples, but this has not always been true. They used to feed on a plant called hawthorn (and were called hawthorn maggots), but in the 1700s when apples were introduced to North America some hawthorn maggots started to feed on apples. Nearly identical as adult flies, the apple maggot evolved from hawthorn maggots when apple trees were introduced to North America. This shift in diet separated the maggots into two groups, hawthorn maggots and apple maggots. Both groups are still biologically very similar, but because of their food preferences they will no longer breed with one another” (“Living Evidence,” April 27, 2005, www.nhm.ac.uk).

The apple-loving hawthorn maggot is still a maggot and it still produces the same kind of fly as the hawthorn maggot. Giving it a new name does not change the fact that nothing of significance has “evolved” beyond its diet. It has not evolved; it has adapted. The admission that “both groups are biologically very similar” is an understatement.

The fact that this type of thing is offered as evidence of evolution by one of the world’s premier natural history museums demonstrates the bankruptcy of Darwinism.

The process that produces minor adaptive changes in a creature and the isolation of various inherent genetic traits has never been demonstrated to be a process that can change one type of animal or plant into another.

2. Natural selection can only “select,” as its name implies; it cannot build.

Being “natural” and therefore blind and unintelligent, natural selection cannot see the future and work toward a goal. It cannot produce new genetic information or new structures. Natural selection knows nothing about propulsion, flight, swimming, breathing, hearing, seeing, blood clotting.....

(Neo-evolutionists add the mechanism of “mutations” to provide new information for natural selection to act on, but we will see that mutations provide no such thing.)

Consider the **bacterial flagellum**. This microscopic motor-driven propeller drives certain bacteria. Molecular scientists are amazed at its “apparent” design. Harvard biologist Howard Berg calls it “the most efficient machine in the universe.” It is composed of a propeller, drive shaft, stator, bushing, u-joint, and a hydrogen ion powered rotary engine. It turns at up to 100,000 revolutions per minute, and can change direction in a quarter of a turn. It can propel itself at speeds up to 60 cell lengths per second, which by proportion is more than twice as fast as a cheetah. “They also have intricate sensors, switches, control mechanisms, and a short-term memory. All this is highly miniaturized. Eight million of these bacterial motors would fit inside the circular cross section of a human hair” (Dr. Walt Brown, *In the Beginning*).

How could natural selection produce such a thing? The evolutionist’s answer is that natural selection used parts from other cellular machinery, but this is ridiculous on its face. How could blind natural selection, which can’t see the future and doesn’t work toward a goal and has no intelligence, “co-opt” various parts to build something like this (even if all of the “parts” exist elsewhere, which they don’t)? How could natural selection even see the need for such a thing, let alone produce it? As Dr. Phillip Johnson says:

“... natural selection doesn’t know a thing about bacterial flagella. ... natural selection can only select for preexisting function. ... for co-option to result in a structure like the bacterial flagellum, we are not talking about enhancing the function of an existing structure or reassigning an existing structure to a different function. Rather, we are talking about reassigning multiple structures previously targeted for different functions to a novel structure exhibiting a novel function” (*Darwin on Trial*, pp. 276, 277).

3. Natural selection, not being able to see or work toward a future goal, would not select something that would not be helpful for the creature's immediate survival.

Charles Darwin wrote:

“On the other hand, we may feel sure that any variation in the least degree injurious would be rigidly destroyed. This preservation of favourable variations and the rejection of injurious variations, I call Natural Selection. Variations neither useful nor injurious would not be affected by natural selection, and would be left a fluctuating element, as perhaps we see in the species called polymorphic” (*On the Origin of Species*, p. 502)

This means that partly-formed and therefore presently-useless structures such as a “developing” wing or leg or flipper or lung or heart would *not* be preserved.

Some clever Darwinists can create a just-so story that finds a beneficial function in *some* partly-formed structure or organ; but what is required from Darwinism is to demonstrate that *every* partly-formed structure or organ is beneficial and is therefore something that would be “selected” because Darwinism requires the routine selection of billions of such things.

Take the example of the bird's marvelous flying wing. Evolutionists theorize that it developed gradually as a reptile became a bird. But a part wing would provide no benefit and would, in fact, be a definite hindrance. If scales somehow gradually lost their hardness on the way to somehow becoming feathers, the protective benefit of the scale would be lost eons before any benefit of flight was achieved.

4. Natural selection requires competition for “survival of the fittest,” but nature shows more symbiosis and interrelatedness than struggle.

Darwin described nature as being everywhere “red in tooth and claw,” but this is not what we see. Evolutionists

such as Pierre-Paul Grassé and Michael Pitman have acknowledged this:

“Far from nature ‘red in tooth and claw,’ each creature is skilled at extracting energy in a different way from its own particular niche in the environment; many of them have roles in the ecosystem that avoid competition. As Grassé noted, even in the mud of a pond ‘... cohabitation of species belonging to groups widely different in system teaches us that in one and the same environment separate types of biological system ensure the survival of one and all” (Michael Pitman, *Adam and Evolution*, p. 78).

Consider pollination. Here we see amazing harmony between flowering plants and the pollinating creatures.

Though nature does demonstrate “tooth and claw” since the fall of man, we do not observe the constant, everywhere-fought struggle for survival via competition that Darwin’s doctrine demands.

5. There are countless examples in nature where “the fittest” are not the ones that survive.

“It is remarkable that Darwin failed to notice the truth in the converse of what he had said; the catastrophes that end lives--drought, flood, starvation, plague--are non-selective. The strong are struck down with the weak. Is the blackbird’s early worm less fit? It has been shown, by night-time photography that lions do not necessarily seek out the smallest, weakest buffalo. They may take fully adult males” (Michael Pitman, *Adam and Evolution*, p. 78).

This is true throughout life. When men go to war, it is not the weakest that go; it is the fittest; and they are the ones who are killed in disproportionate numbers.

In fact, the strongest often sacrifice themselves to secure the survival of the weakest, such as when mother creatures die to protect their young.

Further, there are many creatures and living processes that have survived even though they display no evidence of being the fittest.

Consider the koala. It is perpetually slow and sleepy!

Consider the peacock. Its massive, brilliant array of tail feathers do not give it any advantage in the forest. It is cumbersome for flying; it is the opposite of camouflage; and scientific studies have shown that it is not even attractive to the pea hen!

Consider the human child. It requires nearly two decades of nurture before it is ready to live on its own.

6. Natural selection cannot explain the fact that plants and animals have remained the same for supposed “millions” of years.

If natural selection were true, it would mean that creatures are in a perpetual state of environment-induced change, but many of the creatures observed in the so-called Cambrian layer, which is supposed to be hundreds of millions of years old, are still with us today and haven’t changed at all.

Consider the bat. There are fossils of bats that are dated at 54 million years old, but it is the same creature that flies in “modern” skies. The 54-million-year-old bat looked exactly like a “modern” bat and had the same complex echolocation equipment in its inner ears.

Consider the Lungfish. It is supposed to be 360 million years old, but it hasn’t changed at all. A report in *Nature* magazine observed that the Lungfish’s teeth structure has not changed in all that (supposed) time (“Lungfish dental pattern conserved for 360 million years,” May 31, 2001). As hatchlings, Lungfish have small teeth which fuse into a bony dental plate as it matures. There are thousands of well-preserved fossils of hatchlings and adult Lungfish that exhibit this exact dental development.

Creation Moments well observes, “One cannot escape the conclusion that there has been no evolution of Lungfish since

they first swam the seas. This agrees with Scripture” (“Lungfish takes a bite out of evolution,” *Creation Moments*, Jan. 8, 2011).

7. Natural selection is utterly helpless to produce life in the first place.

Even if natural selection were true and even if it could account for the development of creatures, it would not explain the origin of life. Natural selection can only select; it cannot create. As Michael Pitman writes, “to observe that ‘nature selects the fittest’ is far from explaining where the fittest come from” (*Adam and Evolution*, p. 78).

We see that natural selection offers zero evidence for the doctrine of the evolution of life, and evolution does not qualify as a scientific theory or even a hypothesis. It is a mythical story.

Mutations

Evolutionists believe that genetic mutation is the mechanism that adds information to a creature’s genome so that it can be naturally selected as advantageous and thus produce new types of biological structures and creatures. A mutation is “an error in the DNA of a living organism, an alteration of the genetic code.”

“The theory proposes that there is the infrequent appearance of a mutation where by chance the individual is more favorably suited to its environment. While admitted to be rare, the mutant then finds an exactly matching mate. Then, since they are slightly better fitted to the environment, it is supposed they tend to have more offspring than the normal variants. This chance process is repeated over countless generations, and the small mutant changes accumulate and eventually lead to the appearance of an entirely new species” (Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 159).

Richard Dawkins says:

“... mutation is, ultimately, the only way in which new variation enters the species. All that natural selection can do is accept certain new variations, and reject others” (*The Blind Watchmaker*, p. 125).

The problem is that mutations are very rare, are almost always harmful, and have never proven to provide the type of positive, creative genetic change necessary for evolution. Mutations don't create!

1. Scientists generally agree that known mutations are either neutral in their effect or harmful. Further, they do not add new information to the genome.

Consider the following statements by Theodosius Dobzhansky of Columbia University, who succeeded T.H. Morgan, father of the fruit fly mutation experiments:

“A majority of mutations, both those arising in laboratories and those stored in natural populations, produce deteriorations of viability, hereditary disease, and monstrosities. Such changes, it would seem, can hardly serve as evolutionary building blocks” (*Genetics and the Origin of Species*, p. 73).

“The mass evidence shows that **all, or almost all, known mutations are unmistakably pathological and the few remaining ones are highly suspect**” (*Evolution of Living Organisms*, 1977, pp. 88-103, 170).

Duane Gish, Ph.D. in biochemistry, worked for many years in pharmaceutical research at Cornell University, the University of California, and the Upjohn Company. He co-authored a number of publications in the peptide chemistry. Of mutations, Dr. Gish says:

“The genes are ordinarily very stable. A particular gene (in the form of its successors) may exist many thousands of years without alteration in its structure. Very rarely, however, the chemical structure of a gene does undergo a

change. Such a change is called a mutation. Mutations may be caused by chemicals, X-rays, ultraviolet light, cosmic rays, and other causes. Some may occur during cell reproduction due to copying errors. **Very often a mutation proves to be lethal, and they are almost universally harmful**" (Duane Gish, *The Fossil Record Still Says No*, p. 37).

For mutations to create new structures, organs, and creatures, they would need to add information to the genetic code. A vast amount of new information would be required to turn a "simple" ameba into a man or even a wolf into a whale. But in fact mutations either subtract from the existing genetic code or simply modify it.

"Moreover, the mutation does not introduce a new level of complexity, and it cannot be known that it is a 'step in the right direction'--that it will integrate with other mutations in the future for an increase in functional information that will code for adaptations for greater complexity" (Davis and Kenyon, *Of Pandas and People*, p. 66).

Dr. Ian Macreadie, principal research scientist at the Biomolecular Research Institute of Australia and one of the southern hemisphere's top AIDS researchers, says:

"All you see in the lab is either gene duplications, reshuffling of existing genes, or defective genes (with a loss of information) that might help a bug to survive--say by not being able to fight the drug as effectively. But **you never see any new information arising in a cell**. Sometimes a bacterium can 'inject' information into another one, so it's 'new' to that bacterium--but that information had to arise somewhere, and we just don't observe it happening. It's hard to see how any serious scientist could believe that real information can arise just by itself, from nothing" ("Creation in the Research Lab," *The Genesis Files*, edited by Carl Wieland, p. 36).

Dr. Lee Spetner, a biophysicist who worked at Johns Hopkins University, says:

“But in all the reading I’ve done in the life-sciences literature, **I’ve never found a mutation that added information.** All point mutations that have been studied on the molecular level turn out to reduce the genetic information and not to increase it. ... Information cannot be built up by mutations that lose it. A business can’t make money by losing it a little at a time. The neo-Darwinians would like us to believe that large evolutionary changes can result from a series of small events if there are enough of them. But if these events all lose information they can’t be the steps in the kind of evolution the NDT [neo-Darwinian theory] is supposed to explain, no matter how many mutations there are. Whoever thinks macroevolution can be made by mutations that lose information is like the merchant who lost a little money on every sale but thought he could make it up in volume. ... **Not even one mutation has been observed that adds a little information to the genome. That surely shows that there are not the millions upon millions of potential mutations the theory demands. There may well not be any. The failure to observe even one mutation that adds information is more than just a failure to find support for the theory. It is evidence against the theory**” (*Not By Chance*, 1997, pp. 131, 132, 159, 160).

The million-dollar question is this: where does genetic information come from? Evolution has no answer. Top geneticists say that it does not come through mutations, and obviously it doesn’t come through natural selection. The Bible believer has a simple and effective reply which fits all the evidence. The information in the living cell was placed there by the Creator. Each plant and animal has the exact genetic information needed for its operation survival, and reproduction. There is a certain elasticity within the genetic code to allow the entity to adapt to a changing environment,

but there is no change or “evolution” beyond this simple adaptation.

Consider the mutation that produces **sickle-cell anemia**. This has been offered as an example of a “beneficial mutation,” but we need to look at the whole picture. The mutation does provide some protection from the effects of malaria (the distorted blood cells are not as suitable for the malaria pathogen), but it does so at the expense of a serious and painful impairment to the body’s ability to transport oxygen, an impairment that causes such things as anemia, poor circulation, lack of resistance to infection, and damage to organs. Thus, overall this mutation is much more harmful to the creature than beneficial and would definitely *not* be the path toward turning a reptile into a bird!

Another example offered by evolutionists to demonstrate that mutations can drive evolution is **bacterial resistance to antibiotics**.

For example, the *Staphylococcus* bacterium builds resistance to penicillin. This is said to prove that bacteria evolved by adapting to the environment.

In fact, though, there is no addition of genetic information and therefore no support for creature to creature evolution. This is another example of the evolutionist’s bait and switch tactic. They use the term “evolution” to describe simple adaptability within a species, and then use this to prove that kind to kind “evolution” is possible. The first can be proven, while the second is mere presumption. No matter what type of resistance it develops or what adaptations it makes, the bacterium remains a bacterium; in fact, it remains the same basic kind of bacterium.

Consider two of the major ways that bacteria achieve immunity to antibiotics.

First, some of the bacteria within a certain strain already have immunity to a certain antibiotic. These bacteria therefore survive and multiply, while those lacking this immunity die out. Lee Spetner observes:

“The acquisition of antibiotic resistance in this manner ... is not the kind that can serve as a prototype for the mutations needed to account for Evolution. ... The genetic changes that could illustrate the theory must not only add information to the bacterium's genome, they must add new information to the biocosm. The horizontal transfer of genes only spreads around genes that are already in some species” (“Lee Spetner/Edward Max Dialogue,” 2001, www.trueorigin.org/spetner2.asp).

A few years ago the bodies of three Arctic explorers who died in 1845 were recovered. “Samples of bacteria were taken from their intestines and it was found that some of the bacteria were indeed resistant to modern-day antibiotics. This is just as the creation scientist would predict. There have always been some populations of bacteria that have had genes conferring a resistance to antibiotics” (Alan Gillen, M.D., *Body by Design*, p. 141).

The *Staphylococcus* bacterium isn't “evolving.” It isn't turning into something else. It is simply responding to the environment according to the way that God made it.

Second, some bacteria gain immunity by a *loss* of genetic information. Dr. Lee Spetner gives the example of bacteria that become immune to streptomycin by the decomposition of the ribosome in its cell due to a destructive mutation.

“This change in the surface of the microorganism's ribosome prevents the streptomycin molecule from attaching and carrying out its antibiotic function. It turns out that this degradation is a loss of specificity and therefore a loss of information. The main point is that Evolution ... cannot be achieved by mutations of this sort, no matter how many of them there are. Evolution cannot be built by accumulating mutations that only degrade specificity” (“Lee Spetner/Edward Max Dialogue,” 2001, www.trueorigin.org/spetner2.asp).

Far from being a genetic advance for the bacterium, the mutation causes it to become less functional overall.

Mutations of this sort are the path toward gradual degradation of the creature rather than the path of an upward evolution.

We would warn our readers to beware of Darwinist's citation of genetic research. In spite of the powerful evidence that has built up over the past century against mutations being a mechanism of evolution, some Darwinists still cling to this myth. And they regularly cite new research as proof. In fact, they appear to be fleeing to genetics as the final and ultimate proof of evolution. I believe that this is for two reasons. First, the traditional evidences for evolution (e.g., ape-men, dino-bird, Darwin's finches, peppered moth, Miller experiment, embryonic chart) have been effectively challenged in popular books such as Jonathan Well's *Icons of Evolution*. Second, very few people are equipped to analyze genetic research. Therefore, the average person can't refute Darwinist's claims in this area. This is why they typically make no effort to simplify the results of genetic research and they strive to be as technical as possible even in describing it.

Thankfully, there are qualified geneticists who are skeptical of Darwinism and who are capable of analyzing the new claims.

For example, in the book *The Greatest Show on Earth*, Richard Dawkins says that Richard Lenski's work with the *E. coli* virus has proven that mutations do add information to the genetic code, but in *The Edge of Evolution* Michael Behe, Ph.D. in Biochemistry, has demonstrated that this is not true. "After reviewing the results of Lenski's research, Behe concludes that the observed adaptive mutations all entail either loss or modification--but not gain--of Functional Coding Elements (FCTs)" ("Michael Behe's Quarterly Review," *Evolution News & Views*, Discovery Institute, Dec. 8, 2010).

Even some scientists who believe in evolution have rejected the doctrine that it could be driven by mutations.

I. L. Cohen, mathematician, member of the New York Academy of Sciences, called evolution by mutation a “metaphysical theory.”

“Micro mutations do occur, but the theory that these alone can account for evolutionary change is either falsified or else it is an unfalsifiable, hence metaphysical, theory. I suppose that nobody will deny that it is a great misfortune if an entire branch of science becomes addicted to a false theory. But this is what happened in biology ... I believe that one day the Darwinian myth will be ranked the greatest deceit in the history of science” (Cohen, *Darwinism: The Refutation of a Myth*, 1987, p. 422).

“To propose and argue that mutations even tandem with ‘natural selection’ are the root causes for 6,000,000 viable, enormously complex species is to mock logic, deny the weight of evidence, and reject the fundamentals of mathematical probability” (Cohen, *Darwin Was Wrong: A Study in Probabilities*, 1984, p. 81).

Theodosius Dobzhansky called the hypothesis of evolution by mutation “day dreaming.”

“No matter how numerous they may be, mutations do not produce any kind of evolution. ... A single plant or a single animal would require thousands and thousands of lucky, appropriate events. Thus, miracles would become the rule: events with infinitesimal probability could no longer fail to occur. ... There is no law against day dreaming, but science must not indulge in it” (*Evolution of Living Organisms*, 1977, pp. 88-103, 170).

2. There are amazing repair mechanisms within the cell to thwart the distribution of mutations.

Even if it could be proven that a few mutations are somehow beneficial to the creature, the fact is that there are many mechanisms within the cell that thwart their distribution.

Biologists have identified more than 50 different types of repair enzymes.

Lowell Coker, Ph.D. in microbiology and biochemistry, writes:

“Numerous repair mechanisms have been found which ensure the accuracy of the replication process by correcting any errors that occur, even those that occur after replication in the complete DNA molecule. Please observe that these repair mechanisms work against the hypothesized mechanism of mutation as a principal means for operation in the theory of evolution. ... Each cell continuously monitors and repairs its genetic material. ... **The universal existence of repair mechanisms in DNA not only ensures faithful replication of this master blueprint of life, but also ensures stasis in its function in the manner intended in continuing generations.** This strong evidence falsifies the mechanism of evolution which requires multiple and continued mutation or change over vast periods of time in the DNA molecule, the blueprint of life, to effect the kinds and diversity of life that we see” (Lowell Coker, *Darwin’s Design Dilemma*, pp. 120, 121).

Bacteriologist James Shapiro of the University of Chicago says the cell even has the ability to modify its repair systems:

“It has been a surprise to learn how thoroughly cells protect themselves against precisely the kinds of accidental genetic change that, according to conventional theory, are the sources of evolutionary variability. By virtue of their proofreading and repair systems, living cells are not the passive victims of the random forces of chemistry and physics. They devote large resources to suppressing random genetic variation and **have the capacity to set the level of background localized mutability by adjusting the activity of their repair systems**” (*A Third Way*, p. 33).

Even “simple” bacteria have incredibly effective error-correcting systems. Shapiro writes:

“The fast-growing bacterial cell is the ultimate just in time production facility. When an *E. coli* cell divides every 20 minutes, exquisitely reliable coordination has been achieved for hundreds of millions of biochemical reactions and biomechanical events. ... This incredible precision is accomplished not by rigid mechanical precision -but rather by using **two layers of expert error monitoring and correction systems**: (1) exonuclease proofreading in the polymerase itself, which catches and corrects over 99.9% of all mistakes as soon as they are made (Kunkel & Bebenek, 2000), and (2) the methyl-directed mismatch repair (MMR) system, which subsequently detects and fixes over 99% of any errors that escaped the exonuclease (Modrich, 1991). **Together, this multilayered proofreading system boosts the 99.999% precision of the polymerase to over 99.99999999%**” (Shapiro, “Bacteria are small but not stupid,” Exeter Meeting, 2006).

In commenting on these facts, the blog Truthmatters.info says:

“All cells on planet earth are working very hard to prevent the very thing that supposedly created them!! [e.g. genetic mutations] Think about that!! If that isn’t evidence against the non-Intelligent Design view of Origins then I don’t know what is” (“Did DNA Copying Errors Create Systems for Preventing DNA Copying Errors?” Truthmatters.info, Sept. 12, 2010).

3. The fruit fly experiments prove that mutations do not produce positive change in species.

As we will see in the section on the fruit fly, for one hundred years these creatures have been subjected to every scheme that man can devise to produce mutations. One objective of the experiments has been to prove that evolution is true, but the result has been to disprove it. The only thing that has been produced is crippled and mutant fruit flies. No beneficial mutation has resulted. No different type of fly or different type of creature has been produced. Mutations

produce crippled monsters rather than the beautifully “adapted” creatures we observe in nature.

As E.W. MacBride stated,

“Creatures with shrivelled-up wings and defective vision, or no eyes, offer poor material for evolutionary progress” (quoted in H. Epoch, *Evolution or Creation*, 1966, p. 75).

The scientific facts pertaining to genetic mutations refute the doctrine of evolution and demonstrate that it is not qualified as a theory or even a hypothesis.

The Fossil Record

Museums, textbooks, and documentaries use the fossil record as a major icon of evolution, but the fact is that if you remove the evolutionary presumptions, the evidence refutes evolution and supports creationism.

By way of introduction, we observe that the fossil record is vast.

Charles Darwin knew that the fossil record did not provide evidence for his doctrine, because it did not provide evidence for a vast number of “missing links,” but he believed this “problem” could be explained by the incompleteness of the record and the rudimentary state of paleontology in his day.

This can no longer be used as an excuse. Driven largely by the desire to find evidence for evolution, paleontologists launched a frenzy of activity throughout the 20th century. Today there are an estimated 200 million fossils in museums worldwide, including 100 million invertebrates, one million vertebrates, and one million plants (Carl Werner, *Evolution: The Grand Experiment*, Vol. 1, p. 77). *Evolution: The Grand Experiment* (volume 1) by Carl Werner breaks down the fossil evidence by plant and animal, giving the statistics for specimens in museums worldwide (pp. 76-85).

1. The fossil record cannot prove evolutionary descent.

This point cannot be emphasized too much. An evolutionary view of the fossil record is pure assumption. It is impossible to prove that long-dead creatures have some sort of evolutionary genealogy. This was admitted by Colin Patterson of the British Natural History Museum:

“... statements about ancestry and descent are not applicable in the fossil record. Is *Archaeopteryx* the ancestor of all birds? Perhaps yes, perhaps no: there is no way of answering the question. 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” (Colin Patterson, letter to Luther Sunderland, April 10, 1979, cited from Sunderland’s *Darwin’s Enigma*, pp. 101, 102).

Laying out a line of fossils that have similarities (homology) does not prove that creatures evolved. As Dr. David Stone says: “A fossil record displaying creatures with some modest similarities in form, but enormous differences in other organs, functions, genetics, embryological development, etc., speak directly to special creation and against evolution. If evolution were true, the fossil record would show a continually smooth variation of forms, and classification into species, genera, etc., would be impossible.”

All of the creatures in the fossil record are fully-developed plants and animals. To prove Darwinian evolution would require the existence of a vast number of partly-formed creatures and organs and structures, but apart from a few questionable examples the record does not demonstrate this.

2. The fossil record’s “geological column” has major problems.

The “column” supposedly consists of the **Paleozoic**, the supposed age of multi-celled organisms, fish, and

amphibians, the **Mesozoic**, the age of reptiles and dinosaurs, and the **Cenozoic**, the age of mammals and birds. These three major time periods are further divided into 12 divisions: The Paleozoic consists of Cambrian, Ordovician, Silurian, Devonian, Mississippian, Pennsylvanian, Permian. The Mesozoic consists of Triassic, Jurassic, and Cretaceous. The Cenozoic consists of Tertiary and Quaternary.

One major problem with this is the missing strata.

William Corliss, an evolutionist, acknowledges:

“Potentially more important to geological thinking are those unconformities that signal large chunks of geological history are missing, even though the strata on either side of the unconformity are perfectly parallel and show no evidence of erosion. Did millions of years fly by with no discernible effect? A possible though controversial inference is that our geological clocks and stratigraphic concepts need working on” (*Unknown Earth*, 1980, p. 219).

It would be wiser to admit that the entire principle needs to be discarded because it doesn't fit the evidence.

Another problem is that the “geological column” is often jumbled together.

“Since 1840 there have been many rock formations discovered with fossils completely out of order according to the geologic column--like Precambrian sitting on dinosaur-age Cretaceous--but these have been either explained away or simply ignored” (Luther Sunderland, *Darwin's Enigma*, p. 51).

Another problem is the fossilized trees that pierce geological layers.

This contradicts the idea that the strata were laid down gradually over millions of years. The trees would have rotted away had this been the case. These have been found in Alaska, Alabama, Kentucky, Illinois, Indiana, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Montana, Ohio, Tennessee, West Virginia,

Washington state, England, Germany, France, Nova Scotia, and elsewhere. Near Joggins, Nova Scotia, 14,000 feet of sedimentary strata is exposed in the cliff faces along the Bay of Fundy and there are many fossilized trees piercing 2,500 feet of geological layers. Many others have been found in Lancashire, England, and in the coal fields of Rhein-Westfalen in Germany (Richard Milton, *Shattering the Myths*, p. 84).

Another problem is the out-of-place fossils.

Many out-of-place fossils have been found that disprove the evolutionary fossil column, but they are usually ignored. In the many natural history museums I have visited, I have never seen a discussion of this contradictory evidence.

Walt Brown, Ph.D. in mechanical engineering from MIT and former Chief of Science and Technology Studies at the Air War College, provides the following examples of out-of-place fossils in his book *In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood*:

“For example, at Uzbekistan, 86 consecutive hoofprints of horses were found in rocks dating back to the dinosaurs. Hoofprints of some other animal are alongside 1,000 dinosaur footprints in Virginia. A leading authority on the Grand Canyon published photographs of horselike hoofprints visible in rocks that, according to the theory of evolution predate hoofed animals by more than 100 million years. Dinosaur and humanlike footprints were found together in Turkmenistan and Arizona. Sometimes, land animals, flying animals, and marine animals are fossilized side-by-side in the same rock. Dinosaur, whale, elephant, horse, and other fossils, plus crude human tools, have reportedly been found in phosphate beds in South Carolina. Coal beds contain round, black lumps called coal balls, some of which contain flowering plants that allegedly evolved 100 million years after the coal bed was formed. In the Grand Canyon, in Venezuela, in Kashmir, and in Guyana, spores of ferns and pollen from flowering plants are found in Cambrian rocks--rocks supposedly

deposited before flowering plants evolved. Pollen has also been found in Precambrian rocks deposited before life allegedly evolved. Petrified trees in Arizona's Petrified Forest National Park contain fossilized nests of bees and cocoons of wasps. The petrified forests are reputedly 220 million years old, while bees (and flowering plants, which bees require) supposedly evolved almost 100 million years later. Pollinating insects and fossil flies, with long, well-developed tubes for sucking nectar from flowers, are dated 25 million years before flowers are assumed to have evolved" (Brown, *In the Beginning*, p. 12).

The documentation for these can be found in Dr. Brown's book on pages 67-68.

A list of nearly 200 wrong-order formations in the U.S. alone can be found in an eight-part series by Walter Lammerts ("Recorded Instances of Wrong-Order Formations," *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, September 1984, December 1984, March 1985, December 1985, March 1986, June 1986, December 1986, June 1987).

3. The fossil record disproves evolution in that the fossilization itself is evidence of a great worldwide catastrophe.

The massive worldwide fossil beds are evidence *for* the biblical account of the worldwide Flood. rather than for a uniformitarian evolutionary process.

There is no large-scale fossilization happening today. Fossilization does not naturally occur. Instead, dead animals are quickly consumed by animals, insects, worms, and bacteria, and are destroyed through the action of the environment (sun, rain, wind, moving water, etc.).

This is true even for the largest creatures on earth. The video *Blue Ocean*, produced by the British Broadcasting Corporation, shows a huge dead whale being devoured by fish, worms, and bacteria at the bottom of the sea.

The vast western plains of the United States were once populated with millions of bison, which roamed in enormous

herds until they were nearly slaughtered to extinction during a short period of a time in the late 19th century. Today there is zero evidence of fossil bison. The countless bison skeletons that once littered the landscape simply disappeared through the aforementioned actions.

The Old Testament indicates that the land of Israel was infested with lions for centuries (Job 38:38; Prov. 22:13; 2 Kings 17:25), but there are no fossilized lions there (John Whitcomb, *The World That Perished*, p. 76).

The facts about the true nature of fossilization are typically ignored in natural history museums.

For example, the Chicago Field Museum has a display allegedly proving that fossilization can occur naturally by dead creatures “soaking in ground water for a long, long time.” This doesn’t produce fossilization; it produces disintegrated animals!

The British Museum of Natural History has the same fallacy in its display on fossilization. The following statements are found near a slab of rock containing the fossils of a school of fish:

“Fishy death -- The fossils in this slab belong to a school of fish that died in the same place at the same time. Their freshwater lake dried out during a hot spell leaving the trapped fish to die.”

“How was this fossil fish preserved? When the fish dies, it falls to the sea floor and becomes buried in sediments. The soft body parts rot away leaving the hard bones. Sediment layers accumulate and become compacted over time, forming a rock mould around the skeleton. The skeleton is gradually replaced by other minerals. Over millions of years the sediments may be eroded away exposing the rock containing the fossil.”

These are unscientific statements. Fossilization doesn’t happen this way. When fish die, they are consumed flesh and bone by fish and birds, crabs, worms, bacteria, and by the action of the environment. Dead fish don’t lie on the bottom

of the sea or a dry lake bed waiting for millions of years of fossilization.

The fossil record shows fossilization occurring so rapidly and involving such immense quantities of creatures and preserving such amazing details that it is obvious that they were buried alive in a process that was cataclysmic and anything but gradual.

Clams, for instance, open up soon after they die, but there are fossil graveyards in many parts of the world containing millions of clams that are *closed* (Luther Sunderland, *Darwin's Enigma*, p. 129).

The coal deposits are said by evolutionists to have formed over millions of years, but they contain the fossils of perfectly-preserved skeletons, including two-ton dinosaurs, which would have had to have been covered almost instantly. In 1878, miners working in the Mons coalfield in Belgium discovered 39 iguanodon dinosaur skeletons, many of them complete, at a depth of 322 meters. They were 10 meters long and weighed two tons each. "For their bodies to be rapidly buried would require rates of deposition thousands or even millions of times greater than the average 0.2 millimeters per year proposed by uniformitarians" (Milton, *Shattering the Myths*, p. 84).

There is a seven-foot ichthyosaur that was fossilized while giving birth (Carl Wieland, *Stones and Bones*, 1994).

Amazingly, the fossil record includes millions of "soft-bodied organisms," including bacteria, embryos, plants, leaves, flowers, worms, jellyfish, fish eggs, and insects, including butterflies. Plants and animals have been preserved in the most incredible detail.

Throughout the earth there are massive fossil graveyards that offer profound witness to a global Flood. Consider some examples:

The Burgess Shale in British Columbia contains countless thousands of marine invertebrates that have been preserved in exquisite detail, "with soft parts intact, often with food still

in their guts” (Dr. Andrew Snelling, *Earth’s Catastrophic Past*, Vol. 2, p. 537). It is obvious that they were buried in a highly unusual and catastrophic manner.

“The Burgess Shale is, therefore, an enormous fossil graveyard, produced by countless animals living on the sea floor being catastrophically swept away in landslide-generated turbidity currents, and then buried almost instantly in the resultant massive turbidite layers, to be exquisitely preserved and fossilized” (Snelling, p. 538).

The Ordovician Soom Shale in South Africa is 30 feet thick and stretches hundreds of miles. It contains thousands of exceptionally-preserved fossils. The eurypterids even show “walking appendages that are normally lost to early decay after death” and “some of the fibrous muscular masses that operated these appendages” (Snelling, Vol. 2, p. 538).

“The evidence is clearly consistent with catastrophic burial of countless thousands of these organisms over thousands of square kilometers, which implies that the shale itself had to be catastrophically deposited and covered under more sediments before burrowing organisms could destroy the laminations” (Snelling, Vol. 2, p. 539).

The Devonian Thunder Bay Limestone formation in Michigan is 12 feet thick and stretches for many hundreds of miles. It contains billions of fossils that were catastrophically buried.

The Carboniferous Montceau Shale in central France has yielded the fossilized remains of nearly 300 species of plants and 16 classes of animals. There are fossilized scorpions with their venomous vesicle and sting preserved.

“... numerous footprints of amphibians and reptiles have been found, complete with finger and claw marks, and sinuous lines made by tails trailing in the mud. Even raindrop imprints and ripple marks have been found preserved, signifying that burial and lithification must

have been extremely rapid. Similarly, the preservation of the fragile hinges in the bivalve mollusk fossils suggests that these animals were not transported before burial, but were entombed abruptly by rapid deposition of sediment” (Snelling, Vol. 2, p. 540).

The Carboniferous Francis Creek Shale in Illinois forms a fossil graveyard containing specimens representing more than 400 species of a mixture of terrestrial, freshwater, and marine organisms. The preservation of soft part details is evidence of rapid burial.

The Triassic Mont San Giorgio Basin in Italy and Switzerland, 300 feet deep and about four miles in diameter, contains thousands of well-preserved fossils of fish and reptiles. Details of delicate bones, tiny spines, and scales are distinctly visible. Fossilized fish contain embryos inside their abdomens. The fossilized *Tanystropheus*, a 4.5-meter giraffe-necked saurian, also contains the remains of unborn young.

“Fish, like so many other creatures, do not naturally become entombed like this, but are usually devoured by other fish or scavengers after dying. Furthermore, when most fish die their bodies float. In the fossil assemblage at Mont San Giorgio are some indisputable terrestrial reptiles among the marine reptiles and fishes. Thus, to fossilize all those fish with the large marine and terrestrial reptiles, so that they are all exquisitely preserved, would have required a catastrophic water flow to sweep all these animals together and bury them in fine-grained mud” (Snelling, Vol. 2, p. 543).

The Triassic Cow Brand Formation in Virginia also contains a mixture of fossilized terrestrial, freshwater, and marine plants, insects, and reptiles that were buried together in a massive graveyard. “Microscopic details are preserved with great fidelity, and the resolution of preserved detail is approximately 1 micron” (Snelling, Vol. 2, p. 543).

The Cretaceous Santana Formation in Brazil preserves fossils of marine and land plants and animals, including

shrimp, bivalves, fish, sharks, crocodiles, spiders, frogs, turtles, dinosaurs, and pterosaurs [extinct flying reptiles], including pterodactyles with wingspans of over nine feet.

“Preservation has been so rapid, and so perfect, that structures such as muscle fibers with banding present, some displaying ultrastructure, fibrils, and even cell nuclei arranged in neat rows, have been fossilized. Underneath the scales, small pieces of skin are preserved and show thin sheets of muscle and connective tissue. In a female specimen the ovaries have been preserved with developing eggs inside, and one egg even had phosphatized yolk. Many specimens display the stomach wall with all its reticulations, and often with the last meal still in the stomach. One specimen has no fewer than 13 small fish in its alimentary tract, with a number of shrimps, that even had their compound eyes preserved with the lenses in place. But the most spectacular tissues found in these fish specimens are the gills, many having the arteries and veins of the gills preserved with the secondary lamellae intact. ... It is clear, therefore, that the fossilization process took place moments after the fish had died, and was completed within only a few (probably less than five) hours” (Snelling, Vol. 2, p. 545).

The Siwalki Hills north of Delhi, India, 2,000 to 3,000 feet high and several hundred miles long, are composed of sediment laid down by water and are packed with fossils of land animals.

Similar deposits thousands of feet thick are located ***in central Burma***. These are packed with the fossils of large animals such as mastodon, hippopotamus, and ox, plus fossilized tree trunks.

The Morrison Formation covers an area of about a million square miles in 13 U.S. states and three Canadian provinces, stretching from Manitoba to Arizona, and from Alberta to Texas. Dinosaur bones have been found at hundreds of sites, fossilized together with fish, turtles, crocodiles, and mammals.

The Green River Formation of Wyoming, Utah, and Colorado contains fossils of palms, sycamores, maples, poplars, deep-sea bass, sunfish, herring, alligators, turtles, lizards, frogs, snakes, crocodiles, birds, bats, beetles, flies, dragonflies, grasshoppers, moths, butterflies, wasps, ants, and other plants and animals, terrestrial and marine.

A fossil graveyard near ***Florissant, Colorado***, contains fossilized fish, birds, insects, and hundreds of species of plants. Fruit and even blossoms have been found.

The ***lignite beds of Geiseltal in Germany*** contain “a complete mixture of plants and insects from all climatic zones and all recognized regions of the geography of plants or animals.” Leaves have been so well preserved that alpha and beta types of chlorophyll can be recognized.

“[Also preserved are] the soft parts of insects: muscles, corium, epidermis, keratin, color stuffs as melamine and lipochrome, glands, and the contents of the intestines. Well preserved bits of hair, feathers and scales ... stomach contents of beetles, amphibia, fishes, birds and mammals ... Fungi were identified on leaves and the original plant pigments, chlorophyll and coproporphyrin, were found preserved in some of the leaves” (N. O. Newell, “Adequacy of the Fossil Record,” *Journal of Paleontology*, 1959, 33: 496).

These are merely a few examples of the amazing fossil graveyards that blanket the earth.

As noted, the fossil record contains incredible detail. The trilobite’s compound eye has been fossilized in such detail that scientists have been able to study it microscopically to determine that some of these creatures had 15,000 lenses in one eye, with each lens being double!

There are fossilized “soft bodied” non-vertebrate creatures and even fossilized microscopic bacteria!

So much for Darwin’s claim that the fossil record has not preserved such detail. In *On the Origin of Species* he proclaimed, “No organism wholly soft can be preserved.”

The fossilization that is evident throughout the earth could occur only by a rapid cataclysmic process such as in a global Flood.

4. The fossil record disproves evolution in that it does not contain the countless transitional creatures that Darwinian evolution requires.

In *On the Origin of Species* Darwin acknowledged that his proposition requires *ENORMOUS* numbers of intermediate links. He wrote:

“But just in proportion as this process of extermination has acted on an enormous scale, **so must the number of intermediate varieties, which have formerly existed, be truly ENORMOUS.** Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and serious objection which can be urged against my theory. The explanation lies, as I believe, in the extreme imperfection of the geological record.”

Darwin devoted two chapters of his book to an attempt to explain this problem. His answer to the issue of the missing links was that the fossil record was too incomplete in his day. He predicted that subsequent research would unearth the missing links to prove his doctrine. We have seen, though, that the evidence has failed to materialize.

In fact, subsequent research into the fossil record has refuted Darwin's proposition for those who look at the evidence without bias. Instead of countless numbers of transitional limbs and creatures, evolutionists can only point to a few highly questionable ones.

This has been admitted by some evolutionists, though they have hesitated to say it too loudly lest they give ammunition to the despised creationists and draw upon themselves the wrath of the evolutionary gestapo.

In 1981, Sir Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe, highly respected physicists, wrote:

“... either there were no transitions or the transitions were so rapid as to be analogous to quantum jumps. ... [For flying insects] it is particularly remarkable that no forms with the wings at an intermediate stage of development have been found. Where fossil insects have wings at all they are fully functional to serve the purposes of flight, and often enough in ancient fossils the wings are essentially identical to what can be found today. ... WHEREVER ONE WOULD LIKE EVIDENCE OF MAJOR CHANGES AND LINKAGES ... THE EVIDENCE IS CONSPICUOUSLY MISSING FROM THE FOSSIL RECORD. ... These conclusions dispose of Darwinism” (*Evolution from Space*, pp. 82, 86, 89, 94).

Hoyle was not a creationist; neither is Wickramasinghe. In making this statement they had no agenda of discrediting Darwinism; they were simply being honest with the facts; and the facts are that the fossil record provides no evidence of the myriad of transitional structures and creatures that the doctrine of Darwinian evolution requires. By the way, for their honesty they were persecuted by the evolutionary gestapo.

Many evolutionists claim to have found missing links, but when those “links” are examined they are invariably found to have serious problems, and even the evolutionists themselves cannot agree about them.

Francis Hitching, who is an evolutionist, says:

“It takes a while to realize that the ‘thousands’ of intermediates being referred to have no obvious relevance to the origin of lions and jellyfish and things. **Most of them are simply varieties of a particular kind of creature, artificially arranged in a certain order to demonstrate Darwinism at work, and then rearranged every time a new discovery casts doubt upon the arrangement.** ... The ‘thousands’ of intermediates also

include a number of creatures of about the same explanatory value as the crossopterygian fish--this is, almost none. They are simply **speculative candidates** in the evolutionary ladder--**disconnected links in a hypothetical chain**" (*The Neck of the Giraffe*, p. 19).

In *Evolution: The Grand Experiment* (volume 1), Dr. Carl Werner examines the fossil record for evidence of the evolution of invertebrates, fish, bats, pinnipeds, flying reptiles, dinosaurs, whales, birds, and flowering plants. He traveled to major natural history museums and interviewed the experts. The book provides evidence that all of the "links" are still missing.

Consider the following quotes from scientists who were interviewed for Dr. Werner's book. As far as we know, all of these experts are evolutionists.

Evidence for the evolution of Invertebrates:

"Despite 30 years of research on Ediacaran fossils, there are very few, if any, unambiguous ancestors of things that appear in the Cambrian" (Dr. Andrew Knoll, Paleontologist and Professor of Biology, Harvard University).

Evidence for the evolution of fish:

"... the transition from spineless invertebrates to the first backboned fishes is still shrouded in mystery, and many theories abound as to how the changes took place" (Dr. John Long, an evolutionist and the author of *The Rise of Fishes*).

Evidence for the evolution of bats:

"There's a ten-million-year period of early mammal evolution where you would guess that there'd be some sort of bat precursor, but once again, nothing" (Dr. Gary Morgan, Assistant Curator of Paleontology, New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science and a specialist in bat evolution).

Evidence for the evolution of pterosaurs:

“The ancestors are not known” (Dr. Gunter Viohl, Curator of the Jura Museum, Eichstatt, Germany).

Evidence for the evolution of dinosaurs:

“Early on, again, I think researchers and even maybe lay people really felt that we had more ancestors in the fossil record than we actually do ... **WE DON’T HAVE A LOT OF ANCESTORS; WE HAVE A LOT OF TWIGS**” (Dr. Paul Sereno, Paleontologist and Professor at the University of Chicago and a leading expert on dinosaur evolution).

This quote debunks the evolutionary “Tree of Life.” There is no trunk and no branches, only twigs! This, of course, is evidence for creation and not evolution.

Evidence for the evolution of plants:

“It has long been hoped that extinct plants will ultimately reveal some of the stages through which existing groups have passed during the course of their development, but it must freely be admitted that this aspiration has been fulfilled to a very slight extent” (Dr. Chester Arnold, Professor of Botany and Curator of Fossil Plants, University of Michigan).

We see, therefore, that the fossil record disproves evolution in that it does not contain the countless transitional creatures that Darwinian evolution requires.

5. The fossil record disproves evolution in that it shows creatures appearing suddenly, fully formed, with no evolutionary history.

Jeffrey Schwartz says the major animal groups “appear in the fossil record as Athena did from the head of Zeus--full blown and raring to go” (Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 41).

The testimony of Stephen Gould (d. 2002), one of the most influential evolutionists of the 20th century:

“In any local area, a species does not arise gradually by the steady transformation of its ancestors; **it appears all at once and ‘fully formed’**” (Gould, *Wonderful Life*, cited from Phillip Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, p. 50).

The testimony of D. M. Raup and S. M. Stanley:

“Unfortunately, the origins of most higher categories are shrouded in mystery: commonly new higher categories **appear abruptly** in the fossil record without evidence of transitional forms” (Raup and Stanley, *Principles of Paleontology*, 1971, p. 306).

Eugene Koonin of the National Institutes of Health says:

“Major transitions in biological evolution show the same pattern of **sudden emergence of diverse forms at a new level of complexity**. ... In each of these pivotal nexuses in life’s history [e.g., viruses, bacteria, animal phyla], **the principal ‘types’ seem to appear rapidly and fully equipped** with the signature features of the respective new level of biological organization. No intermediate ‘grades’ or intermediate forms between different types are detectable” (“The Biological Big Bang Model for the Major Transitions in Evolution,” 2007).

The suddenness of the appearance of creatures has even been given the name “**Cambrian explosion**” or “**biology’s big bang**.”

The Cambrian layer is named after rocks in Cambria, Wales. This “layer,” which is supposed to be 500 to 600 million years old, is thought to represent the beginning of life on earth.

Jonathan Wells, Ph.D. in cell biology from the University of California, Berkeley, states:

“Although the abrupt appearance of animal fossils in the Cambrian was known to Darwin, the full extent of the phenomenon wasn’t appreciated until the 1980s, when fossils from the previously-discovered Burgess Shale in Canada were re-analyzed by paleontologists Harry

Whittington, Derek Briggs, and Simon Conway Morris. The 1980s also marked the discovery of two other fossil locations similar to the Burgess Shale: the Sirius Passet in northern Greenland, and the Chengjiang in southern China. All of these locations document the bewildering variety of animals that appeared in the Cambrian” (*Icons of Evolution*, pp. 38, 39).

Spiders

Spiders appear fully developed in the “Cambrian.” There are even fossilized spider webs with bugs caught on them (e.g., on display at the American Museum of Natural History).

Trilobites

“... the trilobites **appear in the geological record suddenly, fully formed** ... without any hint or trace of an ancestor in the many rock layers beneath” (Andrew Snelling, *In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, pp. 294, 295; Snelling has a Ph.D. in geology from the University of Sydney).

Bats

“**Bingo, they just show up**” (Dr. Gary Morgan, Assistant Curator of Paleontology, New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science and a specialist in bat evolution, quoted in *Evolution: The Grand Experiment*, Vol. 1, by Dr. Carl Werner).

“**The bats appear perfectly developed** in the Eocene” (Dr. Gunter Viohl, Curator of the Jura Museum in Eichstatt, Germany, quoted in *Evolution: The Grand Experiment*, Vol. 1, by Dr. Carl Werner).

Pterosaurs

“**When the pterosaurs first appear in the geological record, they were completely perfect**” (Dr. Gunter Viohl, Curator of the Jura Museum, Eichstatt, Germany, quoted in *Evolution: The Grand Experiment*, Vol. 1, by Dr. Carl Werner).

Some evolutionists have pointed to relatively recent discoveries of life at the so-called pre-Cambrian level, but this “does not provide anything like the long history of gradual divergence required by Darwin’s theory” (Wells, *The Icons of Evolution*, p. 38).

Darwinism predicts that the fossil record will show that creatures gradually evolve, but in fact it shows creatures appearing fully formed.

6. The fossil record disproves evolution in that it demonstrates complexity from its earliest layers.

According to the Darwinian doctrine of evolution, life arose from a “simple” creature such as a bacterium to higher and higher life forms.

The fossil record disproves this, even if you allow for evolutionary dating schemes. Creatures appear not only fully developed but with incredibly complex features such as the bat’s echolocation equipment.

“The oldest bat fossils, belonging to an extinct lineage, were unearthed from rocks about 54 million years old, but the creatures that they represent aren’t dramatically different from living bats, says Mark S. Springer, an evolutionary biologist at the University of California, Riverside. Hallmark features of these creatures include the elongated fingers that support the wing membranes and the extensive coiling of bony structures in the inner ears, a sign that they were capable of detecting the high-frequency chirps used in echolocation” (J. Bergman, “Evidence for the Evolution of Bats,” *Origins*, Feb. 2008, cited from Jonathan Sarfati, *By Design*, p. 49).

“The fossil record does not provide evidence for the transition towards either pterosaurs or bats: The earliest known members of these groups had already evolved an advanced flight apparatus” (R. Carroll, *Patterns and Processes of Vertebrate Evolution*, Cambridge University Press, 1998, p. 277).

Consider **the trilobite**, which is found at the earliest stages of life by evolutionary thinking. It is an amazingly complex creature. It is thought to have had a set of gills associated with each of its jointed legs. It would have had complex muscle systems to move its legs. It is thought to have had a circulation system, including a heart. It had antennae which probably had a sensory function. It had a complex brain and nervous system to control all of these organs. The trilobite had a compound eye with as many as 15,000 lenses *per eye*, all of which worked together in perfect harmony to provide exceptional vision for this “simple” creature. Dr. Andrew Snelling calls it “the most sophisticated optical system ever utilized by any organism” (cited from *In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, p. 295).

The mind-boggling complexity of creatures at every level of the fossil record disproves evolution.

In fact, microbiology has taught us that there is no such thing as a “simple creature.” A bacterium is more complex than a modern city.

Darwinism predicts that the earliest forms of life found in the fossil record will be very simple, but in fact what we find is mind-boggling complexity from the beginning.

7. The fossil record disproves evolution in that it exhibits stasis or stability of species rather than change.

Creatures not only appear in the fossil record fully formed but they also retain the same form and habits throughout their existence, even over supposed “millions of years.”

Paleontologists call this observable phenomenon “stasis.”

Steven Stanley, a professor at Johns Hopkins University, pulled no punches in his admission that the fossil record shows stasis rather than gradualism:

“Having carefully scrutinized data from the fossil record during the past decade, however, I have demonstrated a **biological stability for species of animals and plants that I think would have shocked Darwin.** Certainly it

has jolted many modern evolutionists. ... **Once established, an average species of animal or plant will not change enough to be regarded as a new species, even after surviving for something like a hundred thousand, or a million, or even ten million generations. ... Something tends to prevent the wholesale restructuring of species,** once it has become well established on earth” (“The New Evolution,” *Johns Hopkins Magazine*, June 1982, cited from Sunderland, *Darwin’s Enigma*, pp. 117, 118).

Prominent evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould was equally candid:

“Most species exhibit no directional change during their tenure on earth. They appear in the fossil record looking pretty much the same as when they disappear; morphological change is usually limited and directionless” (Gould, *Wonderful Life*, cited from Phillip Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, p. 50)

In February 1980, at a conference at Hobart and William Smith College in honor of Mary Leakey, Gould said:

“The fossil record is imperfect, but I think that is not an adequate explanation ... one thing it does show that cannot be attributed to its imperfection is that **most species don’t change.** ... They may get a little bigger or bumpier but they remain the same species and that’s not due to imperfection and gaps but **stasis.** ...

“The fundamental reason why a lot of paleontologists don’t care much for gradualism is because **the fossil record doesn’t show gradual change** and every paleontologist has known that ever since Cuvier. If you want to get around that you have to invoke the imperfection of the fossil record. Every paleontologist knows that most species don’t change. That’s bothersome if you are trained to believe that evolution ought to be gradual. In fact it virtually precludes your studying the very process you went into the school to study. Again,

because you don't see it, that brings terrible distress" (Luther Sunderland, *Darwin's Enigma*, pp. 121, 122).

This statement is consistent with creation but entirely inconsistent with Darwinian evolution. Gould refused to believe in divine creation, though, so he invented a "theory" of evolution by giant leaps through "punctuated equilibrium," even though there is no scientific evidence for such a thing.

Luther Sunderland, who was an aeronautics engineer with General Electric for 30 years, observed:

"Frank statements like these by Dr. Gould are censored for school materials. Textbooks frequently contain dogmatic statements about how well the fossil record documents evolution, so instead of experiencing 'terrible distress,' students develop a comforting faith that there must be some good evidence somewhere that would substantiate common-ancestry evolution" (*Darwin's Enigma*, p. 122).

Consider the bat. A fossil bat, *Icaronycteris index*, dated at 50 million years old, is on display at the Museum of Natural History at Princeton University, and it looks the same as a "modern" bat.

Consider plants. At the Burke Museum of Natural History in Seattle there is a display of supposed 50 million year old fossilized leaves of cedar, pine, ginkgo, birch, and dawn redwood, and they look exactly like the "modern" varieties. While living on an island in the Pacific Northwest for a decade I had a hobby of studying the regional trees, and in examining the fossil leaves at the Burke Museum it is evident to me that they simply haven't changed.

Not only do creatures look the same throughout their history, they act the same. In 2010, *Discovery News* ran a report on a supposed 100 million-year-old lizard and dragonfly fossilized into amber. The lizard had caught the dragonfly and bit off its head just before being frozen in time by tree resin. The report quotes George Poinar, professor

emeritus at Oregon State University: “This shows once again how behaviors of various life forms are retained over vast amounts of time...” (“Lizard Entombed with Dragonfly Head in Mouth,” *Discovery News*, Oct. 27, 2010).

This stability of behavior is not consistent with an evolutionary view of life, but it is entirely consistent with creation. Creatures remain unchanged because God created them to reproduce after their own kind.

Darwinism predicts that the fossil record will demonstrate constant change and non-stability of species, but in fact it shows sudden appearance followed by amazing stability.

A Warning About the Naming Game

These facts about the stasis of creatures draws attention to the highly questionable nature of evolutionary naming conventions.

Even though the vegetation and animals in the fossil record often look exactly like living things, the fossils are given *different* names.

Dr. Carl Werner has documented this extensively in volume 2 of *Evolution: The Grand Experiment*. After traveling to natural history museums and fossil graveyards in many parts of the world, interviewing scientists and photographing 20,000 fossils, he has demonstrated that the difference between fossil creatures and “modern” ones is based more on evolutionary bias than scientific fact.

He demonstrates this with echinoderms (such as starfish), aquatic arthropods (such as shrimp), land arthropods (such as dragonflies), bivalve shellfish, snails, worms, sponges and corals, bony fish, cartilaginous fish, jawless fish, crocodilians, snakes, lizards, turtles, birds, mammals, cone-bearing plants, spore-forming plants, and flowering plants (including rhododendron, poppies, lily pads, sweet gum, sassafras, walnut, poplar, ash, soapberry, bay, oak, dogwood, magnolia, chestnut, laurel, sycamore, and redwood).

(Dr. Werner also demonstrates that all of these plants and animals lived at the same time as the dinosaurs, debunking the evolutionary myth of “The Age of Reptiles” and the doctrine that flowering plants did not evolve until the end of the “dinosaur age.”)

In the process of this research, Dr. Werner discovered that evolutionists are involved in a “naming game.”

“Examples of all five major classes of echinoderms living today--starfish, brittle stars, sea urchins, sea cucumbers, and sea lilies--have been found in dinosaur rock layers. Even though these fossils look very similar to the modern varieties, they have been assigned completely different genus and species names. **If I ignore the names, it appears that evolution has not occurred. ... I have found examples from every type of land vertebrates living today: amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals. The fossils we found were not strange, unrecognizable animals, but modern-appearing land vertebrates**” (pp. 44, 128).

Dr. Werner concludes:

“If I ignore the genus and species names and simply compare the fossils found in dinosaur rock layers to modern forms, I see a lack of significant change in all of the major animal phyla and all the major plant divisions. **My findings support the idea that animals and plants have not significantly changed (evolved) over time, but simply some animals and plants have gone extinct, while others have remained relatively unchanged**” (p. 241).

Werner also observes that “museum artists frequently leave out modern types of birds when they paint images of dinosaurs” (p. 168). He says: “Not once, at the 60 museums we visited, did I see a fossil of a modern type of bird found with a dinosaur. Yet, when I interviewed the scientists, they were aware of many examples” (p. 232). He said that the same

was true in regard to mammal fossils that have been discovered with dinosaurs.

8. The fossil record disproves evolution in that it demonstrates complexity from its earliest layers.

According to the Darwinian doctrine of evolution, life arose from a “simple” creature such as a bacterium to higher and higher life forms.

The fossil record disproves this, even if you allow for evolutionary dating schemes. Creatures appear not only fully developed but with incredibly complex features such as the bat’s echolocation equipment.

“The oldest bat fossils, belonging to an extinct lineage, were unearthed from rocks about 54 million years old, but the creatures that they represent aren’t dramatically different from living bats, says Mark S. Springer, an evolutionary biologist at the University of California, Riverside. Hallmark features of these creatures include the elongated fingers that support the wing membranes and the extensive coiling of bony structures in the inner ears, a sign that they were capable of detecting the high-frequency chirps used in echolocation” (J. Bergman, “Evidence for the Evolution of Bats,” *Origins*, Feb. 2008, cited from Jonathan Sarfati, *By Design*, p. 49).

“The fossil record does not provide evidence for the transition towards either pterosaurs or bats: The earliest known members of these groups had already evolved an advanced flight apparatus” (R. Carroll, *Patterns and Processes of Vertebrate Evolution*, Cambridge University Press, 1998, p. 277).

Consider **the trilobite**, which is found at the earliest stages of life by evolutionary thinking. It is an amazingly complex creature. It is thought to have had a set of gills associated with each of its jointed legs. It would have had complex muscle systems to move its legs. It is thought to have had a circulation system, including a heart. It had antennae which probably had a sensory function. It had a complex brain and

nervous system to control all of these organs. The trilobite had a compound eye with as many as 15,000 lenses *per eye*, all of which worked together in perfect harmony to provide exceptional vision for this “simple” creature. Dr. Andrew Snelling calls it “the most sophisticated optical system ever utilized by any organism” (cited from *In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, p. 295).

The mind-boggling complexity of creatures at every level of the fossil record disproves evolution.

In fact, microbiology has taught us that there is no such thing as a “simple creature.” A bacterium is more complex than a modern city.

Darwinism predicts that the earliest forms of life found in the fossil record will be very simple, but in fact what we find is mind-boggling complexity from the beginning.

9. The fossil record disproves evolution in that it exhibits stasis or stability of species rather than change.

Creatures not only appear in the fossil record fully formed but they also retain the same form and habits throughout their existence, even over supposed “millions of years.”

Paleontologists call this observable phenomenon “stasis.”

Steven Stanley, a professor at Johns Hopkins University, pulled no punches in his admission that the fossil record shows stasis rather than gradualism:

“Having carefully scrutinized data from the fossil record during the past decade, however, I have demonstrated a **biological stability for species of animals and plants that I think would have shocked Darwin**. Certainly it has jolted many modern evolutionists. ... **Once established, an average species of animal or plant will not change enough to be regarded as a new species, even after surviving for something like a hundred thousand, or a million, or even ten million generations. ... Something tends to prevent the wholesale restructuring of species, once it has become well established on earth**” (“The New Evolution,” *Johns*

Hopkins Magazine, June 1982, cited from Sunderland, *Darwin's Enigma*, pp. 117, 118).

Prominent evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould was equally candid:

“Most species exhibit no directional change during their tenure on earth. They appear in the fossil record looking pretty much the same as when they disappear; morphological change is usually limited and directionless” (Gould, *Wonderful Life*, cited from Phillip Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, p. 50)

In February 1980, at a conference at Hobart and William Smith College in honor of Mary Leakey, Gould said:

“The fossil record is imperfect, but I think that is not an adequate explanation ... one thing it does show that cannot be attributed to its imperfection is that **most species don't change.** ... They may get a little bigger or bumpier but they remain the same species and that's not due to imperfection and gaps but **stasis.** ...

“The fundamental reason why a lot of paleontologists don't care much for gradualism is because **the fossil record doesn't show gradual change** and every paleontologist has known that ever since Cuvier. If you want to get around that you have to invoke the imperfection of the fossil record. Every paleontologist knows that most species don't change. That's bothersome if you are trained to believe that evolution ought to be gradual. In fact it virtually precludes your studying the very process you went into the school to study. Again, because you don't see it, that brings terrible distress” (Luther Sunderland, *Darwin's Enigma*, pp. 121, 122).

This statement is consistent with creation but entirely inconsistent with Darwinian evolution. Gould refused to believe in divine creation, though, so he invented a “theory” of evolution by giant leaps through “punctuated equilibrium,” even though there is no scientific evidence for such a thing.

Luther Sunderland, who was an aeronautics engineer with General Electric for 30 years, observed:

“Frank statements like these by Dr. Gould are censored for school materials. Textbooks frequently contain dogmatic statement about how well the fossil record documents evolution, so instead of experiencing ‘terrible distress,’ students develop a comforting faith that there must be some good evidence somewhere that would substantiate common-ancestry evolution” (*Darwin’s Enigma*, p. 122).

Consider the bat. A fossil bat, *Icaronycteris index*, dated at 50 million years old, is on display at the Museum of Natural History at Princeton University, and it looks the same as a “modern” bat.

Consider plants. At the Burke Museum of Natural History in Seattle there is a display of supposed 50 million year old fossilized leaves of cedar, pine, ginkgo, birch, and dawn redwood, and they look exactly like the “modern” varieties. While living on an island in the Pacific Northwest for a decade I had a hobby of studying the regional trees, and in examining the fossil leaves at the Burke Museum it is evident to me that they simply haven’t changed.

Not only do creatures look the same throughout their history, they act the same. In 2010, *Discovery News* ran a report on a supposed 100 million-year-old lizard and dragonfly fossilized into amber. The lizard had caught the dragonfly and bit off its head just before being frozen in time by tree resin. The report quotes George Poinar, professor emeritus at Oregon State University: “This shows once again how behaviors of various life forms are retained over vast amounts of time...” (“Lizard Entombed with Dragonfly Head in Mouth,” *Discovery News*, Oct. 27, 2010).

This stability of behavior is not consistent with an evolutionary view of life, but it is entirely consistent with creation. Creatures remain unchanged because God created them to reproduce after their own kind.

Darwinism predicts that the fossil record will demonstrate constant change and non-stability of species, but in fact it shows sudden appearance followed by amazing stability.

The uniformitarian “theory” that has dominated geology since Darwin’s day is being rejected even by evolutionists.

The uniformitarian doctrine, devised in Darwin’s day by Charles Lyell, says that the successive geological layers represent millions of years of gradual buildup. He said “the past is the key to the present,” meaning that conditions have remained the same over eons of time. Darwin enthusiastically accepted Lyell’s principle, saying that Lyell had “produced a revolution in natural science.”

By the mid-20th century, uniformitarianism was being rejected.

“The geologic community gave up substantive uniformitarianism long ago” (David Young, *Christianity and the Age of the Earth*, p. 142).

Uniformitarianism is under assault today from the growing evidence that things formerly thought to have required thousands or millions of years can actually occur quickly.

Consider some examples:

Sedimentation

Guy Berthault conducted extensive laboratory experiments demonstrating that sediments naturally and quickly form layers in moving water and that the sediment is sorted in the same manner that is found in the “geological column.” The results of this research was published in the late 1980s and presented to the National Congress of Sedimentologists at Brest in 1991.

“What Berthault found was that when the sediments settled on the bottom they recreated the appearance of the original rocks from which they had come. But the strata were not formed by the deposition of a succession of layers as had been formerly assumed. Instead, the sediments settled on the bottom more or less

immediately, but the fine particles were separated from larger particles by current flow, giving the appearance of layers. Moreover, the lamination was found to have a thickness that was independent of the length of time taken to deposit that sediment--another fundamental assumption of classic geology. 'It follows,' observed Berthault, 'that no deduction of the duration of sedimentation can be made by simple observation of rock laminae' (Milton, *Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, p. 77).

The laboratory work was supplemented by field observations from Mount St. Helens and other places, proving that phenomena such as the formation of canyons previously thought to require thousands or millions of years can occur in a matter of days or even hours.

Stalagmites

It was long thought that stalagmites were formed at an incredibly slow rate and that this proved the ancient age of caves. In fact, stalagmites were used as an icon of evolution for many decades. It is now known that they can form very quickly.

"In Sequoia Caverns, stalactites protected from tourists from 1977-1987 grew 10 inches or 1 inch / year. At this rate they could have grown 300 ft. in just 3600 years. The picture at right is of a bat discovered in 1953 in a stalagmite, in Carlsbad Caverns, New Mexico. The stalagmite grew around the bat before it could decay or be eaten. The temperature where this bat is found is just above freezing at a constant 40° F. The water dripping from the stalactite above it is very salty. This would impede but not prevent decay. Also it would not prevent the bat from being eaten. So this stalagmite still had to form quite rapidly, certainly far less than 5,000 years" (http://creationwiki.org/Stalactites_and_Stalagmites).

Petrified trees

It has also been learned that wood can petrify quickly and that formations such as those in the Petrified Forest National Park of Arizona did not necessarily take long periods of time to form, as previously thought.

“Indeed, as part of a study of the petrified wood in the Petrified Forest National Park of Arizona, an experiment was conducted in which blocks of wood were placed in hot alkaline springs in the Yellowstone National Park to test the rate at which silica is deposited in the cellular structure of the wood. The measured rate was between 0.1 and 4.0 mm/year. Other similar experiments have been conducted in laboratories. Furthermore, as a result of testing for petrification in a Japanese volcanic spring, it was concluded that petrified wood in ancient volcanic ash beds in sedimentary strata in volcanic regions could have thus been silicified by hot flowing ground water with high silica content in a fairly short period of time, in the order of several tens to hundreds of years. Such rapid petrification of wood is confirmed by many field observations of trees cut down by early settlers in Australia that were subsequently buried in the soil, then later dug up and found to be petrified, including the axe marks” (Andrew Snelling, *Earth’s Catastrophic Past*, Vol. 2, p. 958).

Coal

Evolutionists have long used the massive coal beds that are scattered throughout the earth as evidence of an ancient age for the earth, because it is believed that millions of years were required for their formation. It has been demonstrated scientifically, though, that this is a false assumption. Andrew Snelling, Ph.D. in geology, writes:

“Laboratory experiments have been quite successful in artificially producing coal-like materials relatively rapidly, under conditions designed to simulate those present in sedimentary basins where coal measure strata have accumulated. ...

“A research team at the Argonne National Laboratory in Illinois made insoluble material resembling coal macerals (components) by heating lignin with clay minerals at 150 degrees C for 2 to 8 months in the absence of oxygen. It was discovered that the longer heating times produced higher rank coal macerals, and the clays appeared to serve as catalysts that speed the coalification reactions...

“More recent coalification experiments have tried to more closely simulate the natural geologic conditions, with temperatures of only 125 degrees C in both lithostatic and fluid pressures equivalent to burial under 1,800 meters of wet sediments, yet maintained as a geologically open system which allowed by-products that may retard coalification to escape. In that experiment, after only 75 days, the original peat and petrified wood had been transformed into coalified peat and coalified wood, comparable chemically and structurally to lignite and coalified wood from the same geographical region as the original peat and petrified wood samples” (*Earth’s Catastrophic Past*, Vol. 2, pp. 584-586).

Canyons and Stratification

The explosion of Mt. St. Helens in 1980 and the subsequent transformation of the surrounding landscape have provided a laboratory to study the formation of canyons and stratification.

A canyon 700 feet deep and several miles long was carved (at some places even into solid bedrock) by the violent mudflows. One series of canyons are one fortieth the scale of the Grand Canyon in Arizona, with individual canyons having depths of up to 140 feet, with sheer cliffs of up to almost 100 feet (*Earth’s Catastrophic Past*, Vol. 2, p. 718).

The blast also caused the formation of up to 600 feet of strata, caused by landslides, flowing water from Spirit Lake, pyroclastic flows, mudflows, air fall, and stream water.

“In less than five hours, 25 feet of very extensive strata had accumulated, even containing thin laminae and

cross-bedding from 1 mm thick to >1 meter thick, each representing just a few seconds to several minutes of accumulation” (*Earth’s Catastrophic Past*, Vol. 2, p. 724).

It is evident that large canyons and massive stratification can occur very quickly and that these do not require millions of years to form.

The uniformitarian model has also been undermined by newer theories that the world has witnessed a series of global catastrophes, such as the one that allegedly killed off the dinosaurs. The fossil section of the Field Museum in Chicago is arranged around a series of six “mass extinctions” that supposedly wiped out most life forms. These are said to have been caused by things such as shifting continents, volcanic activity, meteors, and “global warming.”

If mass extinctions were caused by dramatic, global events, it is obvious that the earlier view of uniformitarianism was fundamentally wrong, but it was this very doctrine that caused scientists to reject the Bible in the first place! The fact that they won’t admit that a terrible mistake was made and that the Bible needs to be reconsidered is evidence that we are not dealing with rational, empirical science but with religion disguised as science.

The fossil record demonstrates that evolution does not qualify as a scientific theory or even as a hypothesis. It is a mythical story.

Summary of the Ways That the Fossil Record Disproves Evolution

Far from providing evidence for the evolution of life, the fossil record disproves evolution.

1. The fossilization itself is evidence of a great worldwide catastrophe.
2. The fossil record does not contain the countless transitional creatures that Darwinian evolution requires.
3. The fossil record shows creatures appearing suddenly, fully formed, with no evolutionary history.

4. The fossil record demonstrates complexity from its earliest layers.
5. The fossil record exhibits stasis or stability of species rather than change.

Homology

One of the most-used icons of evolution is homology or similarity between creatures, limbs, and organs. This is supposed to show evolutionary descent. Darwin said,

“I should infer from analogy that probably all the organic beings which have ever lived on this earth have descended from some one primordial form, into which life was first breathed” (*On the Origin of Species*).

Practically every modern biology textbook and every natural history museum uses homology as a chief evidence for evolution.

The Prentice Hall *Biology* 2002 textbook is typical. It features a drawing of a limb of a turtle, an alligator, a bird, and a mammal, accompanied by the following note, “[These] homologous structures ... provide evidence of a common ancestor whose bones may have resembled those of the ancient fish shown here.”

The argument from homology or similarity is used in every facet of evolutionary doctrine.

To show how the eye evolved, for example, various types of eyes are arranged in a way that ascends from the simple to the complex.

Homology is used to demonstrate the evolution of the horse. Various four-legged animals are arranged in an ascending lineage, from small to large. They all look vaguely like horses and have four legs, don't they?

Homology is used to demonstrate the evolution of the whale from a wolf-like creature through successful stages to the giant blue whale.

Homology is used to demonstrate the evolution of man from apes. One of the most effective evolutionary icons was the *Parade of Man*, which depicts 15 figures evolving from apes to modern humans. All of the creatures have two arms, and two legs, and two ears, and one nose, and they are walking upright (which is actually a deception), so they must be connected by evolution. This is the argument from homology.

In reply we offer the following points:

1. If you remove the evolutionary assumptions, this amounts to zero evidence.

The statement in the Miller-Levine Biology textbook -- "Each of these limbs has adapted in ways that enable organisms to survive in different environments" -- is pure evolutionary assumption. Nothing is proven.

It could as easily be true that similarity of structure is the product of common design as common descent. When something works, why reinvent the wheel? This is why engineers use devices like gears, wheels, ball joints, solenoids, and switches repeatedly in different kinds of machines. Dr. Terry Mortenson rightly observes:

"Similarity of shape or design can just as well, if not more so, point to a common designer, rather than a common ancestor. Roller skates, bikes, cars, trucks, busses and trains all have wheels, but one is not the ancestor of the other. They are similar because intelligent human designers have all thought that wheels are a good way to move things on land. So too living creatures that share the same planet and are interdependently linked in a complex ecosystem will have many similarities and those which live in very similar environments on earth (e.g., in water or air or on land) will share even more similarities. Our infinitely wise Creator is smarter than all the engineers put together. Good designs can be, and are, easily modified for different applications" (Mortenson,

“National Geographic Is Wrong,” Answers in Genesis, Nov. 6, 2004).

Commenting on the supposed evolution of the eye, William Dembski, Ph.D. mathematics, observes:

“But hasn’t the biological community explained the evolution of such complicated structures as the mammalian eye? Actually it hasn’t. What the biological community has done is noted that there are many different eyes exhibiting varying degrees of complexity--everything from the full mammalian eye at the high end of the complexity scale to a mere light-sensitive spot at the low end. But **slapping down eyes of varying complexity on a chart and then drawing arrows from less complex to more complex eyes to signify evolutionary relationships does nothing to explain how increasingly complex eyes emerged. The gaps between these increasingly complex eyes become unbridgeable chasms once you begin to think like an engineer and actually look at the astonishing and irreducibly complex components.** ... Darwinian stories ... are just-so stories--fictional tales that entertain and lull the Darwinian faithful into thinking they’ve resolved the problem of biological complexity when in fact its solution continues to elude them” (*The Design Revolution*, p. 217).

Why would blind evolutionary processes produce similar structures? Stuart Burgess, an engineer, observes:

“... a classification tree can be produced for any type of man-made device, such as gears, bearings, doors and windows. The reason why a classification tree can be produced for different kinds of man-made products is that these products have intelligent designers who plan similarity. ... The only way in which similarity could be considered evidence for evolution is if the evolutionist could show that the similarity seen in nature is what would be expected from evolution *rather* than design” (*Hallmarks of Design*, p. 120).

2. The argument from homology is based on the unproven assumption that evolution has a mechanism that could create complex structures.

To say that homology is evidence of evolution is to assume that evolution has a mechanism that can account for the creation of complex structures and organs, but this has never been proven. The two classic mechanisms of Darwinism are natural selection and genetic mutation. But natural selection has no creative power. Through environmental pressures, natural selection might be able to “select” a certain beak size on a finch, but it can’t create a beak. A beak is a complex structure that has every sign of being intelligently designed and made. Genetic mutation also has no creative power. As we have seen, mutations are overwhelmingly harmful and do not add the information to the genome that would be required to create complex new structures. Another mechanism proposed by Darwinists is “geographic and reproductive isolation.” This says that when a small group of creatures is isolated by geographic barriers, “evolution” will occur more quickly because of the smaller gene pool. But this only deals with existing genes and offers no possibility of being a mechanism to add new genetic information and create new structures and organs and creatures.

Since Darwinists won’t want to allow “a Divine Foot in the door,” they are back at square one with no answer to the million dollar question: What is the power that fashioned such an amazing world of living things?

3. The founders of the biological classification systems did not believe that homology pointed to evolution.

Carl Linnaeus, who formulated the system for classifying plants and animals that is still used today, and **Georges Cuvier**, one of the founders of comparative anatomy, were not evolutionists and did not believe that the similarities between creatures was evidence that they evolved. Stuart Burgess observes, “It is ironic that many modern scientists

quote classification trees, comparative anatomy and palaeontology as evidence for evolution, when the main founding scientists of these subjects were actually strong supporters of biblical creation” (*Hallmarks of Design*, p. 129).

4. The limbs and creatures typically used as homologies by evolutionists are actually more different than similar.

In reality, a frog’s leg, a bat’s wing, and a horse’s leg are *dramatically* different from a human arm!

And a man is *dramatically* different from an ape!

And a “simple eye” is *dramatically* different from a human eye.

Evolutionists emphasize vague similarities while ignoring vast differences.

5. At the genetic and embryonic level the supposed homologous structures are not formed in the same way or with the same genes.

The *Prentice Hall Biology* textbook (2002) says, “... the limbs ... derive from the same structures in the embryo.”

But this is not the case.

British biologist Gavin de Beer said, “The fact is that correspondence between homologous structures cannot be pressed back to similarity of position of the cells in the embryo, or of the parts of the egg out of which the structures are ultimately composed, or of developmental mechanisms by which they are formed” (cited from Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 71).

Consider the formation of human and frog digits. In humans, cell death divides the ridge into five regions that then develop into digits (fingers and toes). In frogs, the digits grow outward from buds as cells divide (Jonathan Sarfati, *Refuting Evolution* 2, p. 110, citing *Langman’s Medical Embryology* edited by T.W. Sadler and *Australian Frogs* by M.J. Tyler).

Thus, the fact that there are similarities of structures within the animal kingdom is therefore meaningless at the genetic level.

Homology offers zero evidence for the doctrine of the evolution of life.

The Peppered Moth

One of the most oft-used icons for evolution is the peppered moth, *Biston betularia*.

In the book *New Guide to Science*, Isaac Asimov devoted a small section to proving Darwinian evolution and *his sole evidence* was the peppered moth. Stephen Jay Gould also used the peppered moth as one of the supposed irrefutable evidences for evolution (*Hen's Teeth and Horse's Toes*, p. 257).

It has been touted as “evolution’s prize horse” and described as “the slam dunk of natural selection, the paradigmatic story that converts high school and college students to Darwin, the thundering left hook to the jaw of creationism” (Judith Hooper, *Of Moths and Men*, p. xvii).

The following statement from *Biology: The Dynamics of Life* by Merrill Publishing is typical of the way that textbooks use the peppered moth as a major evidence of evolution:

“The evolution of new species is seldom observed because the changes usually require many generations. However, scientists have observed many examples of the natural selection of adaptations. One of the best-studied examples involves the peppered moth in England. During the 1800s, there were two kinds of peppered moths--a common light-colored variety and a rarer dark-colored variety. These moths rested during the day on light-colored tree trunks. In 1850, almost all the moths were light in color. Then, during a rapid expansion of industry around that time, the air became full of smoke and soot. This extreme pollution of the air turned the trunks of trees black. By the end of the century, most of the

peppered moth population in England was dark colored. The light-colored individuals had become rare. ... In 1950, scientists performed an experiment to determine if natural selection had caused the dark variety of moths to become more numerous. They observed light and dark moths in both industrial and rural areas. The experiment showed that birds ate more dark moths in rural areas where the trees were light-colored and more light moths in industrial areas where the trees were dark-colored. Through natural selection, populations of peppered moths had become adapted to living in industrial areas. The experiment showed that organisms whose color provides better camouflage are more likely to survive and reproduce” (*Biology: The Dynamics of Life*, Merrill Publishing, 1991, p. 209).

Thus, in a short time the population of peppered moths in that area changed from predominately light gray to predominately dark colored. The “new” moth was even given a new name, *Biston betularia carbonaria*, a supposed new “subspecies.”

The proposed explanation was that the industrial pollution had killed the light-colored lichen on the trees where the moths rested, and the light-colored moths could therefore be seen more easily against the natural brown of the tree’s bark. Thus, the light-colored moths were eaten by predators at a prodigious rate while the dark-colored ones survived and increased.

This “evidence” for evolution was devised by Bernard Kettlewell. His agenda in quitting his 15-year medical practice was to prove evolution with the case of the peppered moth, and he found what he and his cohorts wanted to see.

“Kettlewell--who, while eccentric, was a gifted naturalist --was part of E.B. Ford's school of ‘ecological genetics’ at Oxford. Ford and his colleagues strived to demonstrate that natural selection--at a time when the concept was under attack by other biologists--was a primary driving force in evolution. They concentrated on moths and

butterflies. Kettlewell's experiments became their showcase example, 'proving' the efficacy of natural selection. Through Hooper's research it becomes clear that the Ford school had a mission, and when you're on a mission you marshal all the facts that support your idea and leave everything else by the wayside. You have a counterintrigue for every possible criticism and you build up a well-fortified edifice" (Craig Holdrege, "The Tyranny of a Concept: The Case of the Peppered Moth," *In Context*, Fall 2002, The Nature Institute).

In the March 1959 edition of *Scientific American*, Kettlewell proclaimed that he had discovered "Darwin's Missing Evidence."

Kettlewell published a photo that became a major icon of evolution and influenced countless people to believe that Darwinian evolution is true. It is a photo of two peppered moths seemingly resting on a tree trunk.

For over a century, the peppered moth has been offered throughout the world as proof of the Darwinian mechanism of "survival of the fittest" or "natural selection," but there are serious problems with this evolutionary icon.

1. The adaptation of a species to its environment and the variety that can be exhibited within a species do not explain Darwinian evolution.

Variety within a species is not evidence for transmutation from one kind of creature to another! Natural selection might sometimes account for the distribution of different colors of moths and for different sizes of dogs and different shapes of beaks on a finch, but it cannot account for life coming into existence or a wolf becoming a whale or a reptile becoming a bird. No matter what an evolutionist might say about light- and dark-colored peppered moths, they are all still moths. In fact, they are still peppered moths. Not even a new color was produced, because the dark-colored moths already existed.

Adaptability of species is not evidence for Darwinian "molecules to man" evolution, but it does fit perfectly into the

biblical model of creation by an all-wise God who designed the creatures to adapt to changing environments on a fallen earth.

2. Studies have debunked the correlation between pollution and tree lichens and the change in moth color.

“Field studies have demonstrated that pollution and tree lichens are not always correlated with a greater proportion of darker moths. In one place, for example, the number of darker moths increased after pollution decreased. In another area, the number of darker moths ‘began decreasing before lichens returned to the trees’” (John Day, *Darwin Day in America*, p. 246).

3. The evidence was doctored.

The aforementioned photograph of moths resting on a tree trunk, which has influenced the thinking and philosophy of countless people, was A FAKE. It turns out that peppered moths don’t naturally rest on tree trunks. The moths were glued to the trunk!

“After more than fifty years it is now admitted that these moths do not rest on tree trunks ... The well-known photograph of the black and white species together that appears in every high-school textbook was taken using two moths glued to a tree trunk” (Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 168).

Jonathan Wells, Ph.D. in cell biology, gives further refutation to the peppered moth myth:

“Since 1980, evidence has accumulated showing that peppered moths do not normally rest on tree trunks. Finnish zoologist Kauri Mikkola reported an experiment in 1984 in which he used caged moths to assess normal resting places. Mikkola observed that ‘the normal resting place of the peppered moth is beneath small, more or less horizontal branches (but not on narrow twigs), probably high up in the canopies.’ ...

“Manually positioned moths have also been used to make television nature documentaries. University of Massachusetts biologist Theodore Sargent told a *Washington Times* reporter in 1999 that he once glued some dead specimens on a tree trunk for a TV documentary about peppered moths (*The Washington Times*, Jan. 17, 1999). Staged photos may have been reasonable when biologists thought they were simulating the normal resting-places of peppered moths. By the late 1980s, however, the practice should have stopped. Yet according to Sargent, **a lot of faked photographs have been made since then.** ...

“Open almost any biology textbook dealing with evolution, and you’ll find the peppered moth presented as a classical demonstration of natural selection in action--complete with faked photos of moths on tree trunks. This is not science, but myth-making” (Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, pp. 149, 150, 155).

In fact, the original researchers knew that peppered moths don’t naturally rest on tree trunks. Cyril Clarke, who was “a bosom friend” of Bernard Kettlewell, said: “In 25 years we have only found two *betularia* on the tree trunks or walls adjacent to our traps” (Judith Hooper, *Of Moths and Men*, p. xviii).

Some have tried to debunk Jonathan Wells’s report on the peppered moth, but they have not been successful. Take Kenneth Miller, for example.

“Kenneth Miller was one of the most vocal defenders of the standard peppered moth story, which he had included in his own textbooks. At a meeting of the Ohio State Board of Education in March 2002, Miller accused Wells of engaging in repeated misrepresentations and even fraud. Wells’s critique of the peppered moth story was exhibit number one in Miller’s indictment: ‘In his book, Dr. Wells made the claim, quote “Peppered moths don’t rest on tree trunks.” But he didn’t present any data. When you do look at the data, what you discover is that the

major observations that have been made of peppered moths in the wild most frequently shows that they rest on tree trunks--and therefore, that claim is incorrect.' As for the photos of peppered moths resting on tree trunks that appear in biology textbooks like his own, Miller insisted that 'those "faked" photographs aren't faked at all; they're real moths, on real trees, in the real positions that moths have actually been found in the wild.' ...

"Readers of Wells's book, however, might have concluded that it was Miller who was engaging in misrepresentation. **Contrary to Miller's claim that Wells 'didn't present any data' in his book to back up his arguments, Wells in fact provided a detailed examination of the scientific research showing that peppered moths do not normally rest on tree trunks.** When Wells responded to Miller's accusations with a careful rebuttal reciting the evidence for his view, Miller posted an essay on his website with the self-pitying title 'Paying the Price.' **Although Miller had previously accused Wells of being a liar and a fraud, he now portrayed himself as an aggrieved victim.** ... According to Miller, Wells's factual rebuttal to Miller's previous attack was an effort 'to smear me.' **Miller also played the religion card, deriding Wells as 'the Reverend Jonathan Wells'** and supplying a link to a Unification Church website. For someone so loudly complaining about smears and 'personal attacks,' it was a performance of giddy chutzpah.

"Despite Kenneth Miller's vigorous public defense of the peppered moth story during the first half of 2002, it was deleted from the next edition of one of his own biology textbooks. The change was just in time. **Later that year a devastating book-length critique of the conventional peppered moth story was published by science journalist Judith Hooper.** Hooper's *Of Moths and Men* suggested not only that the standard peppered moth account was unsupported by more recent research, but that the original experiments by Kettlewell were full of holes. **Wells was fully vindicated, but no apologies**

were forthcoming from his critics” (John Day, *Darwin Day in America*, pp. 247, 248).

The peppered moth demonstrates that evolution does not qualify as a scientific theory or even a hypothesis. It is a mythical story. Its adherents love to “see the non-existent.”

Darwin’s Finches

Another major evolutionary icon is Darwin’s finches.

On the voyage of the *Beagle*, Charles Darwin found several varieties of finches on the Galapagos Islands in the Pacific Ocean 600 miles off the west coast of Ecuador, South America, but these actually played no part in the development of his doctrine. It was not until the 20th century that the finches became an icon of evolution. Percy Lowe first called them “Darwin’s finches” in 1936 and David Lack published a book by that title in 1947 after Julian Huxley urged him to do so, believing that it would help prove Darwinism in the minds of the populace.

We are reminded by this that Darwinists have always been searching for simple icons to convince the public of the truth of their doctrine. These icons are effective because they are simple and highly visual (e.g., Haeckel’s embryos, the horse chart, the peppered month, the Parade of Man, Lucy). It does not seem to matter that the icons do not provide scientific evident for “molecules to man” evolution but rather are based on evolutionary assumptions.

Since the 1940s, Darwin’s finches have become an iconic evidence for evolution. The following from the Miller and Levine *Biology* textbook by Pearson Education (2002) is typical:

“The Grants’ work demonstrates that finch beak size can be changed by natural selection. If we combine this information with other evolutionary concepts you have learned in this chapter, we can devise a hypothetical scenario for the evolution of all Galapagos finches from a

single group of founding birds. Speciation in the Galapagos finches occurred by founding of a new population, geographic isolation, changes in the new population's gene pool, reproductive isolation, and ecological competition" (Miller and Levine, *Biology*, pp. 372, 408).

According to this icon, a slight variety in finch beaks proves that creatures "evolve" in response to a change in their environment. For example, during drought, when only big tough seeds are available, those finches with slightly larger beaks survive better than those with smaller beaks. Voilá, you supposedly have "descent with modification"!

Evolutionists have made much of Darwin's finches. Jonathan Weiner called the change in the finch beak "the best and most detailed demonstration to date of the power of Darwin's process" (*The Beak of the Finch*, 1994).

In reply to this evolutionary icon we offer the following points:

1. The Galapagos finches are still finches.

The minor change in the finches' beaks is not evidence of the evolution of kinds but of adaptation within kinds. There is no evidence here for "molecules to man" evolution. Though evolutionists have been studying the Galapagos finches for nearly a century, there is no evidence that they could ever change into anything else. They haven't even changed into a different kind of bird.

2. Evolutionists have so narrowed the term "species" that finches with very minute differences are labeled different species.

It is important to understand that the modern term "species" is not the same as the biblical "kind" as used in Genesis 1, which is the Hebrew word *baramin*. Andrew Lamb of Creation Ministries writes: "The biblical kind often equates to the family level in the modern biological classification scheme, and sometimes to genus or order. Some excellent

baraminology papers have appeared in recent issues of *Journal of Creation*” (“Sheep and Goats?” Creation Ministries International, 2007).

Evolutionists have played their “species” card to create the illusion that the Galapagos finches have undergone truly significant change. One variety of the Galapagos finch is called *scandens*, while another is called *fortis*. But in 1983 it was found that a male *scandens* bred with a female *fortis* and produced four chicks, proving that they are the same biblical “kind” (Genesis 1:21). As Richard Milton observes:

“In almost all respects, the finches of the Galapagos are so similar that it is difficult to tell them apart. ... It is very difficult for an objective observer to see how a group of finches who ‘find it hard to tell themselves apart,’ and who do in fact interbreed, can legitimately be called different species. ... But it is from this kind of wordplay that all their subsequent claims of speciation and ‘evolution’ flow” (*Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, pp. 150, 151).

3. The Galapagos finches actually provide evidence against evolution.

First, they provide evidence for the Bible’s claim that God made creatures to reproduce after their own kind. This is repeated 10 times in Genesis 1, and this is what we see in finches everywhere. Further, the ability to adapt to the environment is what we would expect if creatures were designed by an Almighty God who knows the future and who knew that His creatures would need to adapt to a changing and oftentimes harsh environment in a sin-cursed world.

Darwin’s finches offer zero evidence for the doctrine of the evolution of life.

The Four-Winged Fruit Fly

Another major icon of evolution is the four-winged fruit fly. The amazing little fruit fly naturally has two wings, and the addition of two more wings through genetic mutations

would seem, at first glance, to support the real possibility that creatures *could* evolve new organs.

Practically every biology textbook uses the fruit fly (*Drosophila melanogaster*) as evidence for evolution. The 2002 Miller-Levine textbook is an example:

“At the beginning of the 1900s, the American geneticist Thomas Hunt Morgan decided to look for a model organism to advance the study of genetics. He wanted an animal that was small, easy to keep in the laboratory, and able to produce large numbers of offspring in a short period of time. He decided to work on a tiny insect that kept showing up, uninvited, in his laboratory. The insect was the common fruit fly, *Drosophila melanogaster*, shown in Figure 11-13. Morgan grew the flies in small milk bottles stoppered with cotton gauze. Morgan found that he could breed a new generation of flies every 14 days. A single pair of flies could produce as many as 100 offspring. *Drosophila* was an ideal organism for genetics because it could produce plenty of offspring, and it did so quickly” (Miller and Levine, *Biology*, Pearson Education, p. 274).

All sorts of mutant flies have been produced from this experimentation. The *Merrill Biology: The Dynamics of Life* textbook shows some of these on page 169. They include vestigial wings, curled wings, white-eyed, prune-eyed, brown-eyed, and eyeless.

One product of the experiments is a four-winged fruit fly. At first glance, this would appear to provide dramatic evidence that genetic mutations can add information and produce new organs, but this is decidedly *not* the case.

What is typically not told about the mutant fruit fly experiments is the following:

1. The four-winged fruit fly is a crippled monstrosity.

The extra wings lack flight muscles, so that not only do they *not* help the creature fly better, they hinder it in flying at all. In fact, the second set of wings are not actually wings.

They are a gross distortion of the insect's two "halteres," which are small appendages behind the wings that enable it to balance in flight. Thus, not only has the four-winged fruit fly lost the effective use of these highly complex organs, it has developed two large, useless mutant appendages.

"As evidence for evolution, the four-winged fruit fly is no better than a two-headed calf in a circus sideshow" (Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, pp. 186, 187, 18).

It has been recently discovered that the fruit fly's halteres are amazingly complex organs. They are "small vibrating organs ... that act as gyroscopic sensors [which] serve as detectors of body angular velocity that quickly trigger muscle action. ... The velocity is sensed by the halteres, processed by a neural controller, and transmitted by the flight motor into specific wing motions that generate aerodynamic torque" (David Tyler, "Design Principles in the Flight Autostabilizer of Fruit Flies," *Uncommon Descent*, March 23, 2010). Experiments have shown that the fruit fly can recover its heading to within 2 degrees in less than a tenth of a second, and the halteres are an integral part of this amazing flight system which the most technologically advanced fighter jet cannot begin to emulate.

2. The mutant flies are constitutionally weaker than the parent form and would be eliminated in a free competition environment.

The Darwinian law of "survival of the fittest" would not "select" the four-wing fruit fly. As we have seen, the extra "wings" are not only useless; they are a positive hindrance. Further, the four-wing fly has difficulty mating, so that "unless the line is carefully maintained in a laboratory it quickly dies out" (Wells, p. 186).

This is true for all of the mutant varieties of fruit flies that have been produced in the laboratory.

"A review of known facts about their ability to survive has led to no other conclusion than that **they [the mutated offspring] are always constitutionally weaker than their parent form** or species, and in a population with free competition they are eliminated ... **Therefore they are never found in nature** (e.g. not a single one of the several hundred [types] of *Drosophila* mutations), and therefore, they are able to appear only in the favorable environment of the experimental field or laboratory" (H. Nilsson, *Synthetische Artbildung*, 1954, p. 1186, cited from the *Evolution Encyclopedia*, Vol. 1, chapter 14).

3. The fruit fly experiments are actually strong evidence against evolution and for biblical creation.

First, the extensive fruit fly experiments, which have been conducted for a century, have proven that mutations do not produce useful new structures or new creatures.

Beginning with the work of Thomas Hunt Morgan at Columbia University in 1906, millions of fruit flies have been radiated, poisoned, and subjected to extreme conditions of light and dark, cold and heat. There were 100 fruit fly genetics labs in the United States alone from the 1930s to the 1960s, and these tested hundreds of thousands of generations of mutant genes (*Creation Spelled Out*, p. 14). Radiation has greatly multiplied the number of mutations that would occur naturally.

The fruit fly was chosen for these experiments because its grows from egg to adult in 10-12 days, lays up to 100 eggs a day, and it is a relatively "simple" creature with only four chromosomes per cell (as if any tiny creature that can fly and reproduce itself could reasonably be called *simple*).

The century of fruit fly experiments represents millions of years of "evolutionary time."

The result has been a variety of mutant fruit flies--with various colored eyes and bodies, different sizes of eyes, no eyes, short wings, large wings, no wings, extra wings, twisted wings, legs growing out of its head, etc.--but absolutely no

evidence that the fruit fly could evolve through mutations into some other type of insect or animal--or even into a different type of fly.

The fruit fly experiments scientifically falsify the neo-Darwinism claim that mutations are the driving force of species-to-species evolution.

“German geneticists Christiane Nusslein-Volhard and Eric Wieschaus were using a technique called ‘saturation mutagenesis’ to search for every possible mutation involved in fruit fly development. They discovered dozens of mutations that affect development at various stages and produce a variety of malformations. Their Herculean efforts earned them a Nobel prize, but **they did not turn up a single morphological mutation that would benefit a fly in the wild**” (Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 190).

Theodosius Dobzhansky, who succeeded T.H. Morgan at Columbia University, made the following telling admission,

“Mutants which equal the normal fly in vigor are a minority, and mutants that would make a major improvement of the normal organization in the normal environments are unknown” (*Evolution, Genetics, and Man*, 1955, p. 105).

Second, the fruit fly experiments demonstrate that the kinds of creatures are stable and that there are strict limits to the amount of change they can experience. These experiments support the Bible’s declaration that God formed every plant and animal to reproduce “after its own kind.”

“No matter what we do to the genes of a fruit fly embryo, there are only three possible outcomes: a normal fruit fly, a defective fruit fly or a dead fruit fly” (Jonathan Wells, “The Problem of Evidence,” *Forbes*, Feb. 5, 2009).

The fruit fly experiments are a powerful refutation of the doctrine of evolution.

Lucy

One of the most widely-used icons of evolution is Lucy, the name given to a fossilized ape of the australopithecine class that is supposed to be millions of years old and is alleged to be a missing link between apes and man.

The Lucy bones have been the subject of fierce debate, even among evolutionists.

Lucy was a tiny creature standing about three and a half feet high.

The bones were found in 1974 in northern Ethiopia by Donald Johanson and his colleagues. "He thereupon declared on the spot that he had discovered a three million year old human ancestor" (Duane Gish, *Evolution: The Fossils Still Say No*, p. 241).

They named the fragmentary skeleton "Lucy" after playing the Beatles song "Lucy in the Sky with Diamonds" repeatedly at the camp party the night of the discovery. John Lennon's 1971 song "Imagine" would have been more suitable, as Johanson and crew were living out the vain Darwinian dream that there is no God, no heaven or hell, only blind evolution. In the chorus, Lennon sang, "You may say that I'm a dreamer, but I'm not the only one/ And some day I hope you'll join us/ And the world will be as one." Evolutionary scientists are at the forefront of pushing this dream of a world united in a damnable myth, and it is a fulfillment of Bible prophecy (e.g., Psalm 2; 2 Timothy 3:1-5; 2 Peter 2:1-2; 3:2-4).

After Johanson announced to the world that he had discovered a new "missing link," he was showered with international acclaim. "The National Geographic Society promised funds and assigned a photographer to Johanson's expedition. Money came from several sources. Johanson's future was secure" (Gish, *The Fossils Still Say No*, p. 243).

Johanson and company believed they had found the original stem that led from *Australopithecus* to man. Thus, they gave the creature the name *Australopithecus afarensis* to

distinguish it from other forms of *Australopithecus*. (There is no consensus on this, though, even among evolutionists.)

Australopithecus has long been promoted as a link in the evolution of man. *The Early Man* (Time-Life, 1965), which contained the famous “Parade of Man,” featured *Australopithecus* prominently as a “Pre-Man.” It was depicted as an upright, hairy semi-ape-faced creature with human arms, hands, legs, and feet. *The Last Human* (Yale University, 2007) describes four types of *Australopithecus*: *anamensis*, *afarensis*, *garhi*, and *africanus*.

(In the chapter on Ape-men, we deal with all of the major evolutionary “ape men,” including Java Man, Piltdown Man, Peking Man, Nebraska Man, *Australopithecus africanus*, Ramapithecus, Zinjanthropus, Ida, Ardi, Homo Habilis, Homo Erectus, and Neanderthal.)

It is impossible scientifically to prove that Lucy was any sort of “missing link.”

As we have seen in the section on the fossil record, it is impossible to prove that one type of extinct creature had any sort of evolutionary connection with another. How could one possibly prove such a thing? Just because there were certain similarities of structure does not prove evolutionary descent. This can only be presumed from a philosophical bias.

The Debate Over Lucy’s Gait

Though evolutionists admit that the creature had an ape’s head and brain and ape-like arms, hands, and feet, and no speech capacity, it is alleged by many that it walked uprightly, which was “the first step toward becoming human.” This is called “bipedalism.”

There is wide disagreement on this point.

Dr. Solly Zuckerman, for many years the head of the Department of Anatomy of the University of Birmingham in England, said of the *Australopithecus* family that “THEY ARE JUST APES” (Roger Lewin, *Bones of Contention*, p. 164). Zuckerman studied the fossils of this creature for 15 years in

minute detail with a team of scientists. They compared every important detail of *Australopithecus* fossils with the bones of hundreds of humans and apes. For example, they compared the pelvic bones of *Australopithecus* with those of more than 70 humans, 94 great apes, and many others of monkeys and baboons. That is an impressive piece of scientific research. Zuckerman concluded that *Australopithecus* did *not* walk erect. He said:

“For my own part, the anatomical basis for the claim that the australopithecines walked and ran upright like man is so much more flimsy than the evidence which points to the conclusion that their gait was some variant of what one sees in subhuman Primates, that it remains unacceptable” (*Beyond the Ivory Tower*, p. 93).

Zuckerman’s detailed scientific research into *Australopithecus*, the largest and most serious project of its nature ever conducted, to my knowledge, was largely rejected by paleoanthropologists. *But this is because his conclusions did not fit their pet theories.* Zuckerman was basically excommunicated by the paleoanthropological community for his conclusions, but this is not because his research and conclusions were scientifically disproven; it was because he veered from the party line.

Zuckerman’s team was not working on the so-called *Australopithecus afarensis* (Lucy) but on fossils of other types of *Australopithecus*, but others have reached the same conclusion for so-called *Australopithecus afarensis*. Further, not everyone believes the Lucy group or the so-called *afarensis* even represents a different category of *Australopithecus*.

In 1982, Bill Jungers at the Stony Brook Institute in New York “argued that **Lucy’s legs were too short, in relation to her arms, for her species to have achieved a fully modern adaptation to bipedalism**” (*Lucy’s Child*, p. 194).

In 1983, Randy Susman and Jack Stern, also of Stony Brook, concluded that Lucy and her kin spent most of their

time climbing trees. They “detailed more than two dozen separate anatomical traits suggesting that the species was a less efficient biped than modern humans” (*Lucy’s Child*, p. 194). **They described Lucy’s hands and feet as being long and curved, typical of a tree-dwelling ape, even more highly curved than a chimpanzee** (Milton, *Shattering the Myths*, p. 207).

That year Susman and Stern reported in the *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*:

“The fact that the anterior portion of the iliac blade faces laterally in humans but not in chimpanzees is obvious. The marked resemblance of AL 288-1 [Lucy] to the chimpanzee is equally obvious” (J. T. Stern and R.L. Susman, *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 80:279, 1983).

Russell Tuttle of the University of Chicago reached the same conclusion as Jungers, Susman, and Stern. He pointed to the **“curved fingers and toes”** as an “apelike adaptation for grasping tree branches.”

In 1983, a conference was held at the Institute of Human Origins at Berkeley in California to discuss the issue of Lucy’s bipedalism. Russell Tuttle argued that the Laetoli footprints could not have been made by a Lucy-type creature because **its long, curved toes and other features would have left a different sort of print** (*Lucy’s Child*, p. 196). Randy Susman emphasized that the creature’s **“strong, curved, apelike finger bones,”** and its **“long arms relative to its legs”** speak of tree living. Jack Stern used features of the hip, knee, ankle, and pelvis as evidence for his view that the creature did not walk in a human fashion.

In 1984, Charles Oxnard, professor of Anatomy and Biological Sciences at the University of Southern California, concluded that australopithecine was definitely not a missing link. “... the australopithecines known over the last few decades from Olduvai and Sterkfontein, Kromdrai, and Makapans-gat, are now **IRREVOCABLY REMOVED FROM**

A PLACE IN THE EVOLUTION OF HUMAN BIPEDALISM, possibly from a place in a group of any closer to humans than the African apes and certainly from a place in the direct human lineage. **All this should make us wonder about the unusual presentation of human evolution in introductory textbooks, in encyclopedias and in popular publications**” (*The Order of Man: A Biomathematical Anatomy of the Primates*, p. 332).

It must be understood that Oxnard is not a creationist. He is an evolutionist, but he is being honest with the facts presented in the fossil record as he sees them.

In 1987, Oxnard did an extensive computer analysis of the existing bones of *Australopithecus* and concluded that it walked like an ape, not a man. He demonstrated that **the creature’s big toe stuck out as in chimpanzees**.

In 1993, Christine Tardieu, an anthropologist in Paris, reported that **Lucy’s “locking mechanism was not developed.”** Humans have a locking mechanism in the knees that allow us to stand upright comfortably for long periods of time. Lucy didn’t have that, so she certainly didn’t stand around nonchalantly like she is depicted in the museums.

In 1994, Dr. Fred Spoor and his colleagues at University College, London, using CT scans of australopithecine inner ear canals, demonstrated that **they did not walk habitually upright** (“New Evidence: Lucy Was a Knuckle-walker,” Creation Ministries International, May 5, 2000, citing F. Spoor, B. Wood and F. Zonneveld, “Implications of early hominid morphology for evolution of human bipedal locomotion,” *Nature* 369(6482):645–648, 1994).

In 1994, Jack T. Stern, Jr., told the 63rd Annual Meeting of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists that he believes that *A. afarensis* **“walked funny, not like humans”** (Gish, p. 257).

In 2000, *Science* magazine reported that Lucy **“has the morphology that was classic for knuckle walkers”** (Erik Stokstad, “Hominid Ancestors May Have Knuckle Walked,”

Science, March 24, 2000, Vol. 287, no. 5461, pp. 2131-2132). Stokstad says, “I walked over to the cabinet, pulled out Lucy, and shazam! -- she had the morphology that was classic for knuckle walkers.”

In 2009, after anthropologists gathered at the Institute of Human Origins in New York to discuss Lucy, a report in the *New York Times* made the following interesting conclusion:

“The debate over whether the primate Lucy actually stood up on two feet three million years ago and walked--thus becoming one of mankind’s most important ancestors--has evolved into two interpretive viewpoints, three family trees, spats over four scientific techniques and too many personality clashes to count. ... The long and short of it is, according to a participant, that **bipedality lies in the eye of the beholder**” (“Did Lucy Actually Stand on Her Own Two Feet?” (*New York Times*, Aug. 29, 2009).

In 2012, researchers who had spent 11 years studying the rarely-found shoulder blades of an *Australopithecus afarensis* skeleton reported that Lucy definitely lived in trees, at least for much of the time. They found that Lucy’s shoulder sockets faced upward like “modern apes” rather than outward as with humans (“Early Human ‘Lucy’ Swing from the Trees,” Fox News, Oct. 26, 2012). Researcher David Green said, “These remarkable fossils provide strong evidence that these individuals were **still climbing [trees]** at this stage in human evolution.”

In fact, there is zero scientific evidence that the little apes were anything other than little apes or that “human evolution” is anything other than a fairy tale.

The fact that textbooks and museums typically portray Lucy as an unquestionable human ancestor and as an upright walker is evidence that their objective is to brainwash the public with an evolutionary myth rather than provide real objective education.

It is probable that “Lucy” and her kin typically walked on all fours like an ape, while walking upright for short

distances. One day in Kathmandu, Nepal, in 2008, I saw a rhesus macaque monkey walk about 100 feet on his back legs. He was just cruising along and seemed very pleased with himself! A macaque monkey at the Israel Zoo walks upright much of the time. Apes can walk upright, but they aren't designed to do it comfortably and naturally like a man does; they are more comfortable climbing trees. The mountain gorilla from Zaire has an arm-leg proportion closer to humans than other apes and "a young gorilla can rear up and walk in a human way, resting on the sole of its foot rather than the side" (Michael Pitman, *Adam and Evolution*, p. 242).

When it comes to Lucy's hands, all authorities agree that they were ape-like, and as for her feet, Dr. Randall Susman and Dr. Jack Stern of the State University of New York at Stony Brook, described them as **"showing a retention of grasping tendencies with long and curved digits"** (*New York Times*, Aug. 29, 2009).

Why would Lucy "evolve" upright walking?

Michael Pitman, who taught biology at Cambridge University, makes the following important observation:

"But if a group of them decided to swing down from the trees and become meat-eating *Homo erectus* on the plain, upright gait would be the last thing they would want. Their first efforts would give them an uncomfortable short-stretch roll, and a slow one at that. Man walks about as fast as a chicken; he runs upright at 12 m.p.h. while the patas monkey can run two-and-a-half times as fast. **Indeed, the new man would have been about the slowest mammal on the savannah; rolling like a boat in high seas and still wearing that tiny chimpish head, he'd have had little chance in the survival stakes**" (*Adam and Evolution*, p. 249).

Lucy Art: Perpetrating a Myth

Artistic reconstructions typically depict Lucy with *human hands, walking uprightly* in a purely human manner on *human feet*, and typically *with human-proportioned arms and*

legs. This is true for the models and drawings that I have seen personally at the Museum of Natural History in New York City, the American Museum of Natural Sciences in Washington D.C., the British Museum of Natural History, the Field Museum in Chicago, Yale University's Peabody Museum, the Museum of Man in San Diego, the St. Louis Zoo, and the natural history museum at Michigan State University Ann Arbor.

These reconstructions are not scientific; they are brainwashing tools.

Dr. David Menton complained to the St. Louis Zoo about their Lucy exhibit, but his protests were rebuffed. Menton, who has a Ph.D. in cell biology from Brown University, said: "I think the zoo owes it to all the people who helped pay for that exhibit to give (Lucy) an honest presentation." But Bruce Carr, the zoo's director of education, said they had no plans to change the exhibit. "What we look at is the overall exhibit and the impression it creates. We think that the overall impression this exhibit creates is correct" (*Creation Ex Nihilo*, Volume 19 Number 1, Dec 1996 - Feb. 1997).

In fact, the overall *impression* that this Lucy model creates is that *Australopithecus* was an ape-man, a creature that had some ape-like features but walked erect like a man and had human hands and feet. This is a *false impression* that is contradicted by the evidence, but it is exactly the impression that they desire to give in these "reconstructions."

The Laetoli Footprints

Most prominent natural history museums feature a model or photo of the Laetoli footprints that purport to prove that evolving apes walked upright "in a human manner" over a million years ago.

The footprints were discovered in 1978 by the team of the famous anthropologist Mary Leakey (wife of Louis) at a site called Laetoli in Tanzania.

Two sets of prints run parallel to each other for a length of about 80 feet. One set of prints is man-sized while the other is smaller. They could have been made by a male and a female or by an adult and a child. There are also many animal prints preserved in the same strata.

The footprints are used as an argument for depicting *Australopithecus afarensis*'s feet (Lucy) as human-like, in spite of the fact that no *Australopithecus afarensis* fossils were found in Laetoli and in spite of the evidence that "Lucy" could not have made the prints. Typical of the claims is that by Niles Eldredge and Ian Tattersall,

"Perhaps the most dramatic evidence of the bipedality of this early form is the set of footprints that have been found at Laetoli" (*The Myths of Human Evolution*, p. 7).

A drawing at the Smithsonian Museum of Natural History depicts human legs and feet making the prints, and the text claims that "*Australopithecus afarensis*" made them. The museum obviously wants its visitors to assume that Lucy had human-like legs and feet.

In reply we offer the following points:

1. If you remove the evolutionary assumptions, there is no reason to think that the footprints were made by any creature other than man.

Mary Leakey and her team were amazed "at how very human they were" (*Ancestral Passions*, p. 486). Tim White, who was involved in excavating the prints, acknowledged:

"They are like modern human footprints. If one were left in the sand of a California beach today, and a four-year-old were asked what it was, he would instantly say that someone had walked there. He wouldn't be able to tell it from a hundred other prints on the beach, nor would you. The external morphology is the same. There is a well-shaped modern heel with a strong arch and a good ball of the foot in front of it. The big toe is straight in line. It doesn't stick out to the side like an ape toe, or like the big

toe in so many drawings you see of *Australopithecines* in books” (Johanson and Edey, *Lucy: The Beginnings of Humankind*, p. 250).

White and his colleagues believe that the “modern human footprints” prove that Lucy had feet like humans and walked in a human fashion, but there is nothing to connect Lucy’s kind with the Laetoli prints other than evolutionary assumption and circular argumentation.

Melvin Lubenow says:

“Interpreting the Laetoli footprints is not a question of scholarship; it is a question of logic and the basic rules of evidence. We know what the human foot looks like. There is no evidence that any other creature, past or present, had a foot exactly like the human foot. We also know what human footprints look like. But we will never know for sure what australopithecine footprints look like, because there is no way of associating ‘beyond reasonable doubt’ those extinct creatures with any fossil we might discover” (*Bones of Contention*, p. 331).

2. The Lucy creature had ape-like feet and could not have made human-looking footprints.

Russell Tuttle has rightly argued that a creature such as Lucy, with long curved toes, could not have left the prints and concluded that “we should shelve the loose assumption that the Laetoli footprints were made by Lucy’s kind” (“The Pitted Pattern of Laetoli Feet,” *Natural History*, March 1990).

Further, the footprints are nearly 12 inches long and were obviously made by a large individual. I am six-feet tall and when I put my size 11 shoe beside a model of the Laetoli footprints at the Seattle Science Center it was obvious that the individual that made those prints could have been comfortable in my shoes.

But Lucy was only three feet tall. My, what big feet she had!

3. The Laetoli footprints are actually evidence against evolution.

If the evolutionary assumptions are removed, the Laetoli footprints are powerful evidence that “modern man” lived at the same time as creatures that are supposedly millions of years old. Either this means that the evolutionary dating methods are wrong and the entire fossil strata concept should be discarded, or it means that “modern man” is millions of years old.

Either way, the Laetoli footprints disprove standard evolutionary thinking.

Vestigial Organs

Another major icon of evolution is the so-called vestigial organ.

“Vestigial organs” are said to be hang-ons from man’s evolutionary past that no longer have a purpose.

In *The Descent of Man*, Charles Darwin proposed “vestigial organs” as proof of his doctrine. He listed wisdom teeth, the appendix, the coccyx (pronounced kock-six) or tailbone, body hair, and other things.

Robert Wiedersheim, a Darwinist in Germany, greatly extended the list of vestigial organs in his book *The Structure of Man*. Wiedersheim added the pineal gland, the pituitary gland, the tonsils, the thymus, the thyroid, and many others--180 in all. Wiedersheim was a world authority and his book was very influential, widely quoted in biology textbooks.

The concept of vestigial organs was so popular as an evolutionary icon that Ernst Haeckel, Charles Darwin’s apostle in Germany, gave it the name *Dysteleology* or “the science of rudimentary organs.”

The refutation of this evolutionary icon is simple. **Today the number of “vestigial organs” in humans has been reduced to ZERO.**

It has been learned, for example, that the **TONSILS** are important in the growth of the immune system. “In the 1930s, over half of the children had their tonsils and adenoids removed. Then medical scientists learned that tonsils are important to young people in helping to establish the body’s defense capabilities by producing antibodies. Once these defense mechanisms develop, the tonsils shrink to a smaller size in adults” (Alan Gillen, *Body by Design*, p. 34).

Researchers at Duke University reported in 2007 that the **APPENDIX** is a safe house for “good bacteria” so the intestine can be repopulated after flushing out a pathogen (“Purpose of Appendix Believed Found,” CNN.com, Oct. 5, 2007)

The human **COCCYX** is not any sort of vestigial tail. Instead it serves as a point of attachment for several important muscles of the pelvic floor (*Of Pandas and People*, p. 128).

Even in this vaunted age of science, our knowledge is only rudimentary.

In 2001, *Nature* magazine published a report about new research that disproves the evolutionary idea that some muscle fibers in the legs of horses are vestigial.

Horses and camels have muscles in their legs with tendons more than 600 millimetres long connected to muscle fibres less than 6 millimetres long. Such short muscles can change length only by a few millimetres as the animal moves, and seem unlikely to be of much use to large mammals. The tendons function as passive springs, and it has been assumed that the short muscle fibres are redundant, the remnants of longer fibres that have lost their function over the course of evolution. But Wilson and colleagues argue... that these fibres might protect bones and tendons from potentially damaging vibrations....

Their experiments show that short muscle fibers can damp the damaging vibrations following the impact of a

foot on the ground. When the foot of a running animal hits the ground, the impact sets the leg vibrating; the frequency of the vibrations is relatively high—for example, 30-40 Hz in horses—so many cycles of vibration would occur while the foot was on the ground if there were no damping. The vibrations might cause damage, because bone and tendon are susceptible to fatigue failure. Fatigue in bones and tendons is the accumulation of damage resulting from repeated application of stresses. Bone fatigue is responsible for the stress fractures suffered by both human athletes and racehorses, and tendon fatigue may explain at least some cases of tendonitis. Wilson et al. suggest that the very short muscle fibres protect both bones and tendons from fatigue damage by damping out vibrations (R. McNeill Alexander, “Biomechanics: Damper for Bad Vibrations,” *Nature*, December 2001).

The Horse Series

Most people living during the past 100 years have seen the horse series, which depicts the supposed “evolution” of the horse from a dog-like creature with three toes to the modern one-toed creature that cowboys and Indians ride in western movies. It must be true, because the chart says so!

The horse series was developed by Othniel Marsh who discovered 30 different kinds of supposed fossil horses in Wyoming and Nebraska in the 1870s. In 1879, after consultation with Thomas Huxley, he arranged these in an evolutionary sequence and put them on display at Yale University’s Peabody Museum.

The exhibit has been duplicated in countless museums and textbooks.

It is featured prominently in the Field Museum in Chicago. On a visit there in 2010, I saw a display of fossils ranging from a small dog-like creature to the “modern” horse. This is accompanied by the following statement:

“... these three horses illustrate a general trend to longer legs with fewer toes. The earliest horses were small and multi-toed. But as grasslands spread, longer legs with lighter single-toed feet allowed horses to run faster and travel farther.”

The three “horses” are as follows:

hyracotherium (56 million years ago), which had multiple small hooves

misohippus (33 million years ago), with longer legs and a bigger central toe

pliohippus (15 million years ago), with even longer legs and a bigger toe

The horse series is still promoted by Yale’s Peabody Museum. On a visit there in 2010, I saw the large display devoted to this myth. In one section of the display, the heads of the “horses” are arranged in six supposed evolutionary steps from small to large: *hyracotherium*, *misohippus*, *miohippus*, *merychippus*, *pliohippus*, *equus*.

The horse series is an ideal evolutionary propaganda tool. Horses are interesting, and the display is easy to comprehend and dramatic in its presentation.

1. This is a vain exercise in homology

The only evidence for evolution is the vague similarity of the creatures when arranged in a certain order. It is impossible to prove scientifically that one fossilized creature descended from another. To make such a claim is speculation. Remove the evolutionary assumption, and the “evidence” disappears. It can as easily be said that each of the fossilized creatures was created by God and there was no evolutionary attachment. The bones themselves simply don’t provide this information!

2. Evolutionists admit that the horse chart is not accurate.

George Simpson, who was so dogmatic about horse evolution in his 1951 textbook *Horses*, had changed his tune

by 1953, claiming that generations of students had been misinformed about the real meaning of the evolution of the horse (*The Major Features of Evolution*, 1953, p. 259). That same year, Simpson wrote, “The uniform, continuous transformation of *Hyracotherium* into *Equuus*, so dear to the heart of generations of textbook writers, never happened in nature” (*Life of the Past*, pp. 125, 127).

In 1979, Dr. Niles Eldredge, curator of the American Museum of Natural History, made the following admission to Luther Sunderland in a taped interview for the New York State Education Department:

“I admit that an awful lot of that has gotten into the textbooks as though it were true. For instance, the most famous example still on exhibit downstairs [in the Natural History Museum] is the exhibit on horse evolution prepared perhaps 50 years ago. That has been presented as literal truth in textbook after textbook. Now I think that that is lamentable, particularly because the people who propose these kind of stories themselves may be aware of the speculative nature of the stuff. But **by the time it filters down to the textbooks, we’ve got science as truth and we’ve got a problem**” (*Darwin’s Enigma*, pp. 90, 91; Sunderland was commissioned by the New York State Education Department to interview influential scientists at five natural history museums for a revision of the state’s Regents Biology Syllabus).

In October 1980, the inaccuracy of the horse chart was admitted by the evolutionists who met at the Chicago Field Museum. In a report on that four-day meeting, Boyce Rensberger said:

“The popularly told example of horse evolution, suggesting a gradual sequence of changes from four-toed fox-sized creatures living nearly 50 million years ago to today’s much larger one-toed horse, has long been known to be wrong. Instead of gradual change, fossils of each intermediate species appear fully

distinct, persist unchanged, and then become extinct. Transitional forms are unknown” (*Houston Chronicle*, Nov. 5, 1980, sec. 4, p. 15).

That is a bold admission!

3. Two major problems with the horse series are as follows:

First, the various types of horses co-exist in the fossil record.

In one fossil graveyard in northeastern Nebraska they found five species of horses co-existing at one time and place, including three-toed and one-toed (Bruce MacFadden, *Fossil Horses*, 1992, p. 255).

Second, there is no reason to consider the *Hyracotherium* any type of horse.

The *Hyracotherium* fossil was discovered by prominent British paleontologist Richard Owen in 1841 and he thought it was a creature similar to the rock badger. This is why he named it *Hyracotherium*, which means hyrax-like animal.

It was evolutionist Othniel Marsh in America who changed the *Hyracotherium* into the *Eohippus* or “dawn horse,” because he and Thomas Huxley, who visited him in 1876, determined that it was the evolutionary predecessor of the horse. There was no scientific reason to believe that the *Hyracotherium* ever evolved into anything else. The decision was based strictly on evolutionary assumptions and objectives. They were desperate to find some missing links.

The reconstructions of *Hyracotherium* in textbooks and museums are designed to make the creature look as horse-like as possible, but this is not science; it is myth-making. Some of the models even depict the creature galloping or pawing the ground and running in herds without a shred of substantiating evidence!

In reality, the *Hyracotherium*'s rear legs were much longer than its front legs and it would have looked and moved nothing like a horse.

4. To arrange horses in an evolutionary order according to size ignores the fact that “modern” horses come in a wide variety.

You could as easily arrange living horses in an impressive “evolutionary order.”

“One modern breed of horse in Argentina averages only 43 centimeters (17 inches) in height. Shire horses weigh up to a ton, while Shetland ponies weigh only 400 pounds. If all three types were to be found fossilized, they could easily be arranged to claim that they have evolved over millions of years to show gradually increasing size” (David Watson, *Myths and Miracles*).

The evolutionary horses series is not science; it is myth making.

The Embryo Chart

Another major icon of evolution is the embryo chart.

The alleged fact that the human embryo looks like that of animals was mentioned by Charles Darwin in *On the Origin of Species*, as follows:

“Thus the embryo comes to be left as a sort of picture, preserved by nature, of the ancient and less modified condition of each animal” (p. 664).

“The embryos, also, of distinct animals within the same class are often strikingly similar” (p. 728).

“Embryology rises greatly in interest, when we thus look at the embryo as a picture, more or less obscured, of the common parent-form of each great class of animals” (p. 735).

The embryo chart was developed by Darwin’s German disciple Ernst Haeckel. He invented *the law of recapitulation* (also called *the biogenetic law*) which stated that the human

embryo progresses from a single cell to a fish to an amphibian to a reptile to a mammal to an ape to a human.

Haeckel summarized this “law” with the saying “ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny.” Ontogeny refers to the growth of the embryo; phylogeny refers to evolutionary history.

Haeckel’s embryo chart first appeared in print in 1866 in his book *Generelle Morphologie der Organismen*. Since then it has been republished in various forms in countless textbooks, journals, popular reports, and museums, and it is still appearing in textbooks in the 21st century. One teacher said, “I have taught Jr. High Science for over 35 years. Every textbook from every major publisher I have ever seen has had Haeckel’s embryos pictured and the text usually claims this as a proof for evolution” (<http://creation.com/fraud-rediscovered>).

The influence of the embryo chart has been incalculable. Carl Werner, M.D., testifies that he was confronted with Haeckel’s embryo chart in his first class in medical school in 1977 and it convinced him that evolution is true.

“These drawings were extremely compelling to me, especially the ‘fact’ that humans had gills and a tail. After this lecture, I found myself rapidly accepting evolution” (*Evolution: The Grand Experiment*, Vol. 2, p. 2).

The problem is that it is a grand scientific fraud, and it has been known to be a fraud since the 19th century!

1. Haeckel fabricated his embryo chart.

That Haeckel was guilty of fabricating his embryo chart was exposed in his own day.

It was exposed first by Ludwig Rutimeyer, a professor at the University of Basel, who brought the fabrications to the attention of the university at Jena. Rutimeyer called the drawings “a sin against scientific truthfulness.” He showed that Haeckel had used the same woodcut of a dog embryo three times to depict the supposed wormlike stage of what he called the embryos of a dog, a chicken, and a tortoise.

Haeckel was convicted at a university tribunal and made a confession of sorts, but even his confession was a lie. He claimed that his draughtsman made the blunder, not acknowledging that *he* was the draughtsman (Russell Grigg, “Fraud Rediscovered,” <http://creation.com/fraud-rediscovered>).

Haeckel’s embryo fraud was also exposed early on by Wilhelm His, Sr., professor of anatomy at the University of Leipzig. Dr. His demonstrated that Haeckel had doctored his embryo charts to make them fit his proposition and concluded that “anyone who engaged in such blatant fraud had forfeited all respect and that Haeckel had eliminated himself from the ranks of scientific research workers of any stature” (Shawn Boonstra, *Out of Thin Air*, p. 47).

Haeckel huffed and puffed at his adversaries, but he was guilty as charged. He mislabeled embryos; he changed the size of embryos; he deleted parts; he added parts; he changed parts. For example, he took a drawing of a monkey embryo and removed its arms, legs, navel, heart, and yolk sac to make it look like a fish embryo. He then labeled it “Embryo of a Gibbon in the fish-stage.”

For his “embryo of man in the fish-stage,” Haeckel either removed or doctored more than half of the embryo’s essential organs.

In spite of his deception, Haeckel continued as a professor at Jena for another 30 years and continued to promote his evolutionary deception far and wide.

In 1915, Haeckel’s fraud was publicized in the book *Haeckel’s Frauds and Forgeries* by Joseph Assmuth and Ernest Hull, which cited 19 authorities, but this carefully documented work was largely ignored by Darwinian scientists and educators in their haste to prove evolution and disprove the Bible.

In the late 1990s, a team led by Michael Richardson, embryologist at St. George’s Hospital Medical School, London, did extensive research into the embryo to test

Haeckel's chart. Richardson gathered an international team of scientists who examined and photographed embryos of 39 different species at stages comparable to those depicted in Haeckel's series. Richardson concluded that Haeckel was "an embryonic liar." In a 1997 interview with Nigel Hawkes, Richardson said:

"THIS IS ONE OF THE WORST CASES OF SCIENTIFIC FRAUD. It's shocking to find that somebody one thought was a great scientist was deliberately misleading. It makes me angry ... What he [Haeckel] did was to take a human embryo and copy it, pretending that the salamander and the pig and all the others looked the same at the same stage of development. They don't ... These are fakes" (Nigel Hawkes interview with Richardson, *The Times*, Aug. 11, 1997, p. 14).

2. A major error of Haeckel's embryo chart is the misidentification of "gill slits" on the human embryo.

In fact, they are not gill slits at all. They have no respiratory function at any stage. Dr. Alan Gillen states:

"The so-called 'gill slits' are really wrinkles in the throat region. This body tissue becomes the palatine tonsils, middle ear canal, parathyroid gland, and thymus. ... These folds in the neck region of the mammalian embryo are not gills in any sense of the word and never have anything to do with breathing. They are merely inward folds, or wrinkles, in the neck region resulting from the sharply down-turned head and protruding heart of the developing embryo" (Gillen, *Body by Design*, p. 33).

3. Haeckel's myth that the developing human embryo is animal-like has encouraged the modern abortion industry.

Dr. Henry Morris wrote:

"We can justifiably charge this evolutionary nonsense of recapitulation with responsibility for the slaughter of helpless, pre-natal children--or at least for giving it a

pseudo-scientific rationale” (*The Long War against God*, 1989, p. 139).

Haeckel believed that the embryo is still in the evolutionary stage and not fully human. He said that it is “completely devoid of consciousness, is a pure ‘reflex machine,’ just like a lower vertebrate” (Richard Weikart, *From Darwin to Hitler*, p. 147).

Thus, killing an unborn baby would be no different than killing an animal.

Haeckel taught that even a newborn child has no soul and therefore infanticide “cannot rationally be classed as murder” (Haeckel, *The Wonders of Life*, 1904, p. 21). He not only supported abortion but infanticide as well. For physically or mentally handicapped infants, Haeckel recommended “a small dose of morphine or cyanide” (Weikart, p. 147).

In 1990, the famous astronomer Carl Sagan and his wife, Ann Druyan, argued that abortion is ethical on the grounds that the fetus is not fully human until the sixth month. Taking Haeckel’s recapitulation “theory” as fact, they claimed that the embryo begins as “a kind of parasite” and changes into something like a fish with “gill arches” and then becomes “reptilian” and finally “mammalian.” By the end of the second month, the fetus “is still not quite human” (“The Question of Abortion: A Search for the Answers,” *Parade*, April 22, 1990). Later, in his book *Billions and Billions*, Sagan denied that he was referring to Haeckel’s “theory” of recapitulation, but his statement was disingenuous. Though Sagan didn’t use the term “recapitulation,” he was definitely using the concept of recapitulation, that the human embryo goes through “apparent” stages of evolutionary development in the womb.

4. The only evidence for evolution in the embryo chart is the assumption of evolution!

The embryo chart is actually a vain exercise in homology. Consider the following statement from a 2002 biology textbook:

“In their early stages of development, chickens, turtles, and rats look similar, providing evidence that they shared a common ancestry” (*Prentice Hall Biology*, p. 385).

Why is this “evidence” of a “common ancestry”? Laying out a series of embryos and saying that they are similar in appearance is actually *zero* evidence that the creatures share an evolutionary descent. As usual, remove the evolutionary assumption and the “evidence” simply disappears!

5. Haeckel’s law is still being taught!

In spite of the fact that Haeckel was caught red-handed fabricating the embryo chart and in spite of the fact that there was never a hint of evidence for the doctrine of recapitulation, the Haeckel chart was used widely throughout the 20th century and, in fact, is still used today.

Walter Bock of the Department of Biological Sciences of Columbia University said, “... the biogenetic law has become so deeply rooted in biological thought that it cannot be weeded out in spite of its having been demonstrated to be wrong by numerous subsequent scholars” (*Science* 164:684, 1969).

Child psychologist Benjamin Spock promoted Haeckel’s doctrine of recapitulation in his popular books:

“Each child as he develops is retracing the whole history of mankind, physically and spiritually, step by step. A baby starts off in the womb as a single tiny cell, just the way the first living thing appeared in the ocean. Weeks later, as he lies in the amniotic fluid of the womb, he has gills like a fish...” (*Baby and Child Care*, 1957, p. 223).

No wonder Spock had no clue about how to raise a child, when he thought that the child is an evolved fish!

Biology textbooks continue to use the embryo chart as a major evidence for evolution. In some cases, they repeat Haeckel's doctrine of recapitulation, but it is more common for the embryo chart to be used today as an example of homology.

Biology: The Dynamics of Life by Merrill Publishing (1991) goes full bore for the doctrine of recapitulation:

“The fossil record indicates that aquatic, gill-breathing vertebrates preceded air-breathing land forms, and comparisons of embryos of different classes of vertebrates support this view of evolutionary change. An embryo is an organism in its earliest stages of development. In the early stages of embryo development of reptiles, birds, and mammals, a tail and gill slits can be observed. As you know, fish use gills to breathe under water. Fish embryos retain these structures; reptile, bird, and mammal embryos lose them as their development continues. In the human embryo, a tail is visible up to the sixth week of development. In humans, the tail disappears, but in fish, reptiles, and birds the tail is retained into maturity” (*Biology: The Dynamics of Life*, p. 202).

The Prentice Hall *Biology* textbook of 2002, edited by Kenneth Miller and Joseph Levine, uses the embryo chart as homology, as we have seen.

Modern Biology by Holt, Rinehart, and Winston (1999) features the chart on page 291 with this accompanying text: “Although modern embryologists have discovered that Haeckel exaggerated some features in his drawings, it is true that early embryos of many different vertebrate species look remarkably similar.”

Observe how casually this scientific textbook whitewashes Haeckel's blatant deception!

While some evolutionists are using modified editions of Haeckel's embryo chart, others have removed his name and

attributed the chart to Karl Ernst von Baer, the discoverer of the female egg cell. This is a great error, because von Baer taught *against* Darwinian evolution as well as *against* Haeckel's doctrine of recapitulation!

This error of attributing embryonic recapitulation to von Baer actually started with Charles Darwin, who quoted him in *On the Origin of Species*.

“Darwin cited von Baer as the source of his embryological evidence, but at the crucial point Darwin distorted that evidence to make it fit his theory. Von Baer lived long enough to object to Darwin's misuse of his observations, and he was a strong critic of Darwinian evolution until his death in 1876” (Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 86).

In the 2006 documentary *Flock of Dodos*, Randy Olson claimed that Jonathan Wells lied in saying that Haeckel's embryo chart has appeared in many modern textbooks. The documentary shows someone flipping through a textbook unable to find the diagrams and with Olson eventually finding only a 1914 textbook containing the embryo chart.

“The clear message communicated was that Wells and other ID proponents were perpetrating a hoax. But if anyone was perpetrating a hoax, it was Olson. ... In 2001, *New York Times* science reporter James Glanz stated that Haeckel's ‘drawings were reproduced in textbook after textbook for more than a century,’ including a textbook coauthored by Bruce Alberts, then-head of the National Academy of Sciences, and Nobel Prize-winning geneticist James Watson” (John West, *Darwin Day in America*, p. 266).

While some evolutionists have downplayed the significance of the Haeckel drawings, Stephen Jay Gould, one of the most influential evolutionists of this generation, admitted that it was shameful that the drawings were perpetuated throughout the 20th century:

“But we do, I think, have the right to be both astonished and ashamed by the century of mindless recycling that has led to the persistence of these drawings in a large number, if not a majority, of modern textbooks!” (“Abscheulich!” *Natural History*, March 2000, pp. 42, 44–45).

Science is self-correcting, we are told. But deceptive evolutionary icons such as the embryo chart, the horse series, and the peppered moth have continued to be used decade after decade even though they have been either totally debunked or seriously questioned, and rarely are readers/students informed of the heavy cloud of doubt that hangs over them.

Great spiritual and moral damage can be done by the perpetuation of myths. Not only did Haeckel’s false doctrine provide phony evidence for evolution, it gave ammunition for the murder of unborn babies and provided intellectual fodder for the eugenics movement and the Nazi death machine.

“The scientific tradition established by the work of Haeckel and his followers enabled the Nazi doctors to erase the healing/killing boundary by enforcing the grandiose Volkish mission for the healing of the German race by killing off the ‘lower races.’ It was the stamp of scientific legitimacy afforded by academia that enabled the great evils to come” (Phil Orenstein, July 2006, www.discoverthenetworks.org).

(For more on this see the chapter “Darwin’s Social Influence.”)

The Miller Experiment and the Primordial Soup Myth

In 1953, Stanley Miller of the University of Chicago performed a scientific experiment that has become a major

icon of evolution. It is widely used as evidence for the proposition that life can generate from chemicals.

Miller was a graduate student in the laboratory of Harold Urey at the University of Chicago (winner of the Nobel Prize in Chemistry in 1934), and their experiments were an attempt to validate an idea proposed by Alexander Oparin and J.B.S. Haldane, Marxists who were attempting to disprove creationism. They theorized that the original atmosphere of the earth allowed the formation of organic compounds which produced a “prebiotic soup” (before biological life) or “primordial soup” that became the birthplace of self-assembling life. (To believe in “self-assembling life” requires far more faith than belief in an Almighty Creator.) Oparin and Haldane theorized that the early earth had an atmosphere composed primarily of methane, hydrogen, ammonia, and water vapor, *with little or no free oxygen*. As we will see, the lack of oxygen was a necessary ingredient in their proposition.

They did not propose these compositions because they had scientific evidence that such an atmosphere actually existed at any point of earth’s history, but because this type of atmosphere was believed by them to provide the best chance for the evolution of life.

Urey had concluded that the Oparin-Haldane “theory” was correct, and Miller joined him in attempting to demonstrate that the “building blocks of life” could originate in such an environment.

The Miller-Urey experiment consisted of the creation of a gaseous environment to simulate the alleged atmosphere of the early earth with the insertion of an electric discharge to simulate lightning.

“Miller and Urey placed a mixture of gases into a flask containing water. These gases were in the proportions believed present in the primitive atmosphere of Earth. The flask was subjected to electrical sparks that simulated lightning. Miller and Urey also repeatedly heated and

cooled the mixture, simulating changes in daily temperatures” (*Merrill Biology: The Dynamics of Life*, 1991).

In spite of the nebulous and highly questionable character of Miller’s experiment, the claim was made by evolutionists that the mystery of life’s origin had been solved.

The *New Scientist* magazine ridiculously proclaimed, “In the beginning ... life assembled itself” (S. Fox, *New Scientist*, Feb. 27, 1969).

The Miller experiment continues to be referenced in textbooks and used as evidence for evolution. It is typical to leave the impression with readers that the experiment was successful.

Dr. Gary Parker, a geneticist who once used the Miller experiment as an icon for evolution in his science classes before he rejected the doctrine of evolution, says that Miller (1) used the wrong materials, (2) established the wrong conditions, and (3) got the wrong results. “Other than that,” Dr. Parker quips, “it was a brilliant experiment!”

1. The Miller experiment is based on evolutionary assumptions.

The Miller experiment *assumes* a universe and an earth and a primordial soup in which life could evolve. But science has not proven that the universe and the earth could have happened by chance naturalistic means so that it could be the birthplace of evolutionary life. There are hypotheses, such as the big bang and multi-universes, but these are not scientific facts. The Miller experiment is meaningless apart from evolutionary assumptions.

There is no scientific evidence for the “pre-biotic soup” doctrine of evolution. It is, in fact, a grand myth based on evolutionary assumptions and wishful thinking:

“Considering the way the pre-biotic soup is referred to in so many discussions of the origin of life as an already established reality, it comes as something of a shock to

realize that there is absolutely no positive evidence for its existence” (Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*; Denton has a Ph.D. in biochemistry from King’s College London).

2. Miller used the wrong materials.

Since Miller conducted his experiment, scientists have determined that the atmosphere of a supposed ancient earth would not have been composed of the elements used in the experiment. Dr. Jonathan Wells says, “For more than a decade most geochemists have been convinced that the experiment failed to simulate conditions on the early Earth, and thus has little or nothing to do with the origin of life” (*Icons of Evolution*, p. 11).

Most significantly, it has been demonstrated that oxygen has always been present in large quantities.

“Canadian geologists Erich Dimroth and Michael Kimberly wrote in 1979 that **they saw ‘no evidence’ in the sedimentary distribution of iron ‘that an oxygen-free atmosphere has existed at any time during the span of geological history** recorded in well preserved sedimentary rocks.’ ... [In 1982] British geologists Harry Clemmey and Nick Badham wrote that the evidence showed **‘from the time of the earliest dated rocks at 3.7 billion years ago, Earth had an oxygenic atmosphere.’** ... In fact, evidence for primitive oxygen continues to mount: Smithsonian Institution paleobiologist Kenneth Towe (now emeritus) reviewed the evidence in 1996, and concluded that **‘the early Earth very likely had an atmosphere that contained free oxygen.’** ... Although geochemists were sharply divided on the oxygen issue, they soon reached a near-consensus that the primitive atmosphere was nothing like the one Miller used” (Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, pp. 16, 18, 19).

And the presence of oxygen would preclude organic synthesis.

“An electric spark in a closed container of swamp gas (methane) might produce some interesting organic molecules, but if even a little oxygen is present the spark will cause an explosion. Just as a closed container excludes oxygen and prevents swamp gas from exploding, so compartments in living cells exclude oxygen from the processes of organic synthesis. ... Since free oxygen can destroy many organic molecules, chemists often must remove oxygen and use closed containers when they synthesize and store organic chemicals in the laboratory. But before the origin of life, when there were neither chemists nor laboratories, the chemical building blocks of life could have formed only in a natural environment lacking oxygen ” (Wells, pp. 12, 13).

“Without this assumption [that a primeval atmosphere had an absence of oxygen], the whole evolutionary scenario fails, for even the simple organic compounds--the smallest bricks of living material--would have crumbled as soon as they formed if oxygen were present” (Michael Pitman, *Adam and Evolution*, p. 138; Pitman taught biology at Cambridge).

3. The Miller experiment added unnatural elements.

The conditions of the experiment were not realistic.

Under normal conditions hydrogen escapes into space, but it had no way to escape in the Miller experiment.

Further, under normal conditions any soluble organic products that happened to be formed would be quickly broken down, but Miller precluded this by building a trap in his apparatus to prevent such an occurrence.

“The spark of electricity used by Miller to create the amino acids would have destroyed them under real conditions. The same spark that puts amino acids together also tears them apart and it’s much better at destroying them than making them. Gary Parker says, ‘Miller knew this, so he circulated the gases, trapped out the molecules he wanted using a well-known biochemist trick. But that would be cheating, because you are

supposed to say that this is how life arose before there was any intelligent design. So it's the wrong conditions" (*A Question of Origins*, DVD, Eternal Productions).

As Michael Pitman, biology teacher at Cambridge, observes:

"As water finds its own level, the natural tendency is towards chemical equilibrium; earth's tendency is not to produce proteins, DNA and other complex molecules, but to destroy them" (*Adam and Evolution*, p. 52).

4. The Miller experiment got the wrong results.

Even if the Miller experiment had produced proteins (which it did not), it would have fallen far short of its objective, which was to prove that life could arise from chemicals.

Nothing that has been produced in these experiments was living or self-replicating. Proteins do not exist and proliferate on their own. They operate as part of the mechanism of the living cell.

The main product of the Miller experience, in fact, was tar!

"What Miller actually produced was a poisonous brew that would destroy any hope for the chemical evolution of life" (*A Question of Origins*).

"The theistic evolutionary paleontologist Simon Conway Morris called the product of typical 'origin-of-life' experiments 'muck,' 'goo' and 'gunk,' echoing chemical evolutionist Graham Cairns-Smith's term 'grossly contaminated gunks'" (Jonathan Sarfati, *By Design*, p. 170).

The trace amounts of amino acids that were produced were both "left-handed and right-handed. "But only the "left-handed" amino acids make up the proteins of life, and just one right-handed molecule prevents the creation of proteins.

Stephen Grocott, Ph.D. in organometallic chemistry from the University of Western Australia and a leading research scientist in industrial chemistry, says:

“Even if there were some source of optical activity in a primordial ‘soup,’ it would quickly disappear anyway. The recent idea of polarized light from a nearby galaxy doesn’t help. They talk of it possibly causing a slight imbalance, say 51 percent right-handed and 49 percent left-handed. But in time that will decay anyway, and you need 100 percent pure, not just a slight increase” (“The Creation Couple,” *The Genesis Files*, edited by Carl Wieland, p. 68).

“Suppose that you could go back in your time machine to a time when, according to evolutionists, a lifeless world existed. Assume that you have taken with you an ocean full of organic precursors of life. What would happen to them? They would all decompose to simpler and simpler molecules and mostly would end up as lifeless common inorganic substances. **Sterilize a frog and put it in a sterile blender--buzzzzzz. Seal up the mixture in a sterile container and leave it as long as you want. You won’t get life,** despite the fact that you started with the best possible mixture of so-called precursors to life. Repeat the experiment a million times--in the sun, in the dark; with oxygen, without; with clay, without; with UV, without. It won’t make any difference. Thermodynamics clearly states that the mixture will decompose to simpler, lower energy, less information-containing molecules” (*In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, p. 149).

5. Even if some type of life *could* be made in a test tube it would only prove that intelligence is required to create life!

Biologist Michael Behe observes:

“Making the molecules of life by chemical processes outside of a cell is actually rather easy. Any competent chemist can buy some chemicals from a supply company, weigh them in the correct proportion, dissolve them in an appropriate solvent, heat them in a flask for a predetermined amount of time, and purify the desired

chemical produce away from unwanted chemicals produced by side reactions. Not only can amino acids and nucleotides--the building blocks--be made, but a chemist can then take these and produce the buildings themselves: proteins and nucleic acids. As a matter of fact, the process for doing this has been automated, and machines that mix and react chemicals to give proteins and nucleic acids are sold by a number of commercial firms. ... Most readers will quickly see the problem. **There were no chemists four billion years ago.** Neither were there any chemical supply houses, distillation flasks, nor any of the many other devices that the modern chemist uses daily in his or her laboratory, and which are necessary to get good results" (*Darwin's Black Box*).

6. The modern science of genetics has falsified the idea of life arising from non-life for those who have eyes to see.

Phillip Johnson observes,

"The simplest organism capable of independent life, the prokaryote bacterial cell, is a masterpiece of miniaturized complexity which makes a spaceship seem rather low tech" (*Darwin on Trial*, p. 105).

Dr. Stephen Grocott says:

"I enjoy seeing the mental gymnastics of people trying to explain the origin of life. Most researchers in the area are honest enough to say they haven't got the faintest idea how life began from non-life. **The mind boggles at the complexity of the simplest single-celled organism--and the more we learn, the more complex it looks**" ("The Creation Couple," *The Genesis Files*, edited by Carl Wieland, p. 68).

In Charles Darwin's day, the cell was thought to be a simple blob of protoplasm. Working within the realm of this ignorance, it was possible for evolutionists to believe that natural processes could have produced life. Darwin's German disciple Ernst Haeckel believed that life is constantly forming in the mud at the bottom of the sea. He called this mythical

living substance “monera” and believed it provided the base of the “tree of life.” In *The History of Creation* (1868) he described the appearance, eating habits, and reproductive cycle of monera. He even drew pictures of them.

“They consist entirely of shapeless, simple homogeneous matter ... a shapeless, mobile, little lump of mucus or slime ... organisms without organs.”

He even gave the monera the scientific name of *Protamoeba primitiva*.

Today we know that the simplest living cell is more complicated than a modern city.

The living cell is a living body with organs. It has blueprints, decoders, error checkers, quality control systems, power plants, power storage units, manufacturing plants, chemical plants, assembly lines, disposal units, trash compactors, a complex communication system, recycling centers, detoxification plants, transportation highways and tracks and tunnels, transportation vehicles, living walls with many types of one-way and two-way guarded, gated portals to the outside world, an external matrix to connect with other cells, and a host of other things.

Michael Denton, Ph.D. in biochemistry, says:

“Nearly every feature of our own advanced machines has its analogue in the cell: artificial languages and their decoding systems, memory banks for information storage and retrieval, elegant control systems regulating the automated assembly of parts and components, error fail-safe and proof-reading devices utilized for quality control, assembly processes involving the principle of prefabrication and modular construction” (*Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, pp. 328, 329).

The cell contains not only the blueprint of the plant or animal’s body and the information describing its every function but also the ability to actually fashion and operate it.

Even a “simple” *E. coli* bacterium has about 4,640,000 nucleotide base pairs, which code for 4,288 genes, each of which produces an enormously complex protein machine (Jerry Bergman, Ph.D. biology, *In Six Days*, p. 25).

The information in the DNA in one human cell is equivalent to a library of 4,000 books, each containing 500 pages. Yet it is so amazingly micro-engineered that all of the DNA from every person who has ever lived would weigh less than an aspirin tablet (Dr. Walt Brown, *In the Beginning*).

This knowledge has forced many scientists to the conclusion that life could not have arisen spontaneously.

Henry Zuill, Ph.D. in biology, says, “Complexity of the cell is now just too daunting to flippantly assert biochemical evolution to explain it ... And if cells could not originate naturally, then nothing else could” (*In Six Days*).

Consider Francis Crick, the co-discoverer of DNA’s double helix structure. Though he was an evolutionist and an opponent of Christianity, he realized that life could not have spontaneously arisen in “a warm pond.” Crick wrote:

“An honest man, armed with all the knowledge available to us now, could only state that in some sense, the origin of life appears at the moment to be almost a miracle, so many are the conditions which would have had to have been satisfied to get it going” (*Life Itself: Its Origin and Nature*, 1981, p. 88).

Esteemed British scientist Sir Fred Hoyle reached the same conclusion. He called the idea of life evolving by chance in a primordial soup “nonsense of a high order.” He likened such an event to zillions upon zillions of blind men solving the Rubik cube simultaneously.

“Anyone with even a noodling acquaintance with the Rubik’s cube will concede the near impossibility of a solution being obtained by a blind person moving the cube faces at random. Now imagine 10 to the fiftieth power blind persons (standing shoulder to shoulder, these would more than fill our entire planetary system)

each with a scrambled Rubik's cube and try to conceive of the chance of them all simultaneously arriving at the solved form. You then have the chance of arriving by random shuffling (random variation) of just one of the many biopolymers on which life depends. **The notion that not only the biopolymers but the operating program of a living cell could be arrived at by chance in a primordial soup here on Earth is nonsense of a high order**" (Hoyle, "The Big Bang in Astronomy," *New Scientist*, November 19, 1981, p. 527).

7. Every evolutionary origin of life "hypothesis" has the same fatal flaw: it cannot bridge the barrier between non-life and life.

There are many theories as to how life evolved from non-life, but they are more ridiculous than realistic. They amount to nothing more than a batch of "just-so" stories. Not one of the theories provides a realistic bridge of the gulf from non-life to life, from inert chemicals to living, self-replicating systems.

This is true for the prokaryote cell "theory," the RNA-first "theory," the deep sea vent "theory," the peptide "theory," the iron-sulfur "theory," the autocatalysis "theory," the clay "theory," the catalytic noise "theory," and all the others.

To propose a microsphere or a water bubble or a protobiont or a proteinoid or some such thing as the path toward life is meaningless, because none of these are living, self-replicating things. In such scenarios, you are still left on the non-living side of the chasm.

In reality, evolutionists have failed entirely and miserably in their attempts to produce life in a test tube or even to demonstrate that such a thing is within the realm of possibility. Life does not self-generate. Life is generated by life. That is real science. The "life generates itself" story is science fiction.

An excellent discussion of the Miller experiment can be found in *Of Pandas and People*. Authors Percival Davis and

Dean Kenyon demonstrate that the seven assumptions of Oparin's hypothesis of earth's early atmosphere were wrong.

Whale Evolution

Another icon of evolution is the supposed evolution of the whale from a land animal.

In the first edition of *On the Origin of Species*, Charles Darwin speculated that the whale evolved from the bear:

“In North America, the black bear was seen by Hearne swimming for hours with widely open mouth, thus catching, like a whale, insects in the water. Even in so extreme a case as this, if the supply of insects were constant, and if better adapted competitors did not already exist in the country, I can see no difficulty in a race of bears being rendered, by natural selection, more and more aquatic in their structure and habits, with larger and larger mouths, till a creature was produced as monstrous as a whale” (p. 567).

Because zoologists of Darwin's day considered this story “preposterous,” which it doubtless was, he removed it from later editions of *On the Origin of Species*; but he said privately that he regretted giving in to his critics (R. Milner, *The Encyclopedia of Evolution: Humanity's Search for Its Origins*, p. 463).

Today evolutionists believe that the whale evolved either from a cat-like animal, a wolf-like animal, or a hippopotamus-like animal. Probably the most popular idea is that the whale evolved from a **MESONYX**, a small, hairy, four-legged mammal similar to a wolf, or from a similar creature called a **SINONYX**.

The whale evolution chart at the Pacific Science Center in Seattle depicts the entire whale family evolving from a little wolf-like animal. There is a reconstruction of the wolf-like “pro-whale” at the British Museum of Natural History.

Except for the change from the bear to a wolf, the story of whale evolution hasn't changed much since Darwin's day. Consider the following "just-so" story from *National Geographic* magazine:

"The whale's ascendancy to sovereign size apparently began sixty million years ago when hairy, four-legged mammals, in search of food or sanctuary, ventured into the water. As eons passed, changes slowly occurred: hind legs disappeared, front legs changed into flippers, hair gave way to a thick, smooth blanket of blubber, nostrils moved to the top of the head, the tail broadened into flukes, and in the buoyant water world the body became enormous" (*National Geographic*, Dec. 1976).

This evolutionary story has as much factual basis as a Hindu myth.

Further, the reconstructions have not been scientifically honest.

Consider **RODHOCETUS**, which has been proposed as a missing link between the land mammal and the whale is. It is depicted in museums and textbooks as a creature that has some whale-like features such as a long whalish snout, a whalish tail or fluke, and flippers, but with four legs-- short ones in the back and longer ones in the front.

The scientist responsible for the reconstruction of *Rodhocetus* is Dr. Phil Gingerich of the University of Michigan. He oversaw the drawing of *Rodhocetus* for the university's museum of natural history. It depicts a slim aquatic creature with a long toothy snout, a fluked tale, and flipper-like hands on its legs and feet.

While filming for the video documentary *Evolution: The Great Experiment*, Dr. Carl Werner, noticed a discrepancy at the university's fossil display between drawings of *Rodhocetus* and the actual fossils. In particular, there are no fossils for the fluke or the flippers, the very things that are used as evidence that this creature is a missing link in the evolution of the whale.

In an interview, Dr. Gingerich confirmed that the drawings are mere speculation. He said, “We don’t have the tail in *Rodhocetus*. We don’t know for certain whether it had a ball vertebra indicating a fluke or not. So I SPECULATED that it might have had a fluke.” Gingerich also acknowledged that the flippers were drawn without fossil evidence and subsequent findings have confirmed that that *Rodhocetus* did *not* have flippers. He said:

“Since then, we have found the forelimbs, the hands, and the front arms of *Rodhocetus*, and **we understand that it doesn’t have the kind of arms that can be spread out like flippers are on a whale. If you don’t have flippers, I don’t think you can have a fluked tail** and really powered swimming. So I now doubt that *Rodhocetus* would have had a fluked tail” (*Evolution: The Grand Experiment*, Vol. 1, p. 143).

Gingerich’s answers on camera were a bombshell, since even the museum’s own drawings still had flippers on the creature.

After showing the amazing interview with Dr. Gingerich, *Evolution: The Grant Experiment* concludes:

“Many experts consider whales to be the best fossil evidence for evolution but are unaware of these discrepancies. Opponents of evolution contend that whale evolution is nothing more than hopeful supposition. If museum diagrams are redrawn and corrected for various discrepancies opponents argue that whale evolution is nonexistent.”

It is important to note that the same documentary features interviews with scientists who cite *Rodhocetus* as indisputable evidence for the evolution of the whale! For example, Dr. Taseer Hussain, paleontologist and professor of anatomy at Howard University and research associate at the Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History, says on camera: “We have a complete, modern whale-type structure in *Rodhocetus*” (*Evolution: The Grand Experiment*, Vol. 1, p.

143). This highly-placed scientist continues to promote an icon of evolution that has been totally discredited.

Consider **PAKICETUS**. This proposed missing link was also discovered by Phil Gingerich in Pakistan. Gingerich claimed that “in its morphology, *Pakicetus* is perfectly intermediate, a missing link between earlier land mammals and later, full-fledged whales” (Gingerich, “The Whales of Tethys,” *Natural History*, April 1994, p. 86). It was trotted out in the 2001 PBS series “Evolution.” Though only a few skull fragments had been unearthed, it was claimed that the creature had “an inner ear like a whale’s” and it was depicted as swimming and catching fish underwater. On the flimsiest fossil “evidence,” Gingerich provided an illustration for schoolteachers of the *Pakicetus* swimming underwater like a whale, propelling itself with fin-looking paws and a stumpy tail allegedly on its way to disappearing altogether (Jonathan Sarfarti, *Refuting Evolution* 2, p. 136). This fanciful reconstruction was based on a mere few bone fragments!

When more bones of *Pakicetus* were unearthed, whale experts J. Thewissen, E. Williams, L. Roe, and S. Hussain stated in *Nature* magazine that it was strictly a land animal. “All the postcranial bones indicate that pakicetids were land mammals...” (“Skeletons of Terrestrial Catceans and the Relationship of Whales to Artiodactyls,” *Nature*, Sept. 20, 2001).

The new drawing of *Pakicetus* shows a creature very different than the one broadcast by PBS and depicted in other forums. It was actually a dog-like animal with a pointy snout and a long tail. No swimming underwater like a whale, no finnish-looking paws, no stumpy tail on the way to disappearing. There is zero evidence that the *Pakicetus* had anything whatsoever to do with whales!

Consider **BASILOSAURUS**, which is also used as a link in the chain of whale evolution. It was featured in the Discovery Channel’s series *Walking with Dinosaurs* and also in the

National Geographic's special report "Evolution of the Whale" (November 2001).

Basilosaurus was a large sea creature, for sure, but it was probably a reptile. Though some evolutionists claim it was a mammal, the evidence that it was cold blooded is impressive. Career biology teacher Kenneth Poppe says:

"Its vertebral column, teeth, and nostrils much more resemble the seagoing dinosaurs called *mosasaurus* and *plesiosaurus*, and the small turbinates in the skull show it to be a cold-blooded creature. ... paleontologists are adamant the *basilosaurus* was not an intermediate in transition, but an established and permanent species in its own right that has no close ancestors or descendants. ... why is the reptile *basilosaurus* directly used to connect mammalian rodents to mammalian whales?" (*Reclaiming Science from Darwinism*, pp. 205, 208).

Further, the evolutionary time line is wrong. Dr. Lawrence Barnes, a whale evolution expert at the Natural History Museum in Los Angeles, notes that the *Basilosaurus* didn't live until after "modern" whales evolved. He says: "... *Basilosaurus* existed at a time when baleen-bearing *mysticetes* [baleen whales] are known to have existed, and echolocating odontocetes [toothed whales] are presumed to have existed" (*Evolution: The Grand Experiment*, Vol. 1, p. 144).

The alleged "evidence" for whale evolution really boils down to two things, and they are nothing more than evolutionary assumptions.

First, there is homology, meaning the similarity between certain creatures that fit the evolutionary model of how whale evolution should have happened. A typical chart is the one at the Museum of Natural History at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. At the top is a dog-like creature and below that are three other creatures that grow progressively more similar in shape to a whale (though all the while being dramatically *different* from the whale). Even if these extinct creatures actually looked like the evolutionary drawings,

which in some key cases is highly doubtful, this does not add up to evidence for whale evolution.

Evolutionary descent cannot be proven for fossils. It is impossible to prove that long-dead creatures have some sort of evolutionary genealogy. This was admitted by Colin Patterson of the British Natural History Museum:

“... statements about ancestry and descent are not applicable in the fossil record. Is *Archaeopteryx* the ancestor of all birds? Perhaps yes, perhaps no: there is no way of answering the question. 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” (Colin Patterson, letter to Luther Sunderland, April 10, 1979, cited from Sunderland’s *Darwin’s Enigma*, pp. 101, 102).

Remove the evolutionary assumptions, and the “evidence” disappears. It is just as logical to believe that each of the fossil creatures was created by God. In fact, this view is far more scientific, because science has demonstrated repeatedly that the various kinds of life forms have built in boundaries that cannot be breached. The millions of fruit fly experiments, for example, prove this. No matter what is done to the creature, it remains a fruit fly. No new structures or functional organs are formed; no new creature arises. Since this is true for creatures living today, creatures that we can scientifically examine, there is no good reason to believe that it was not true for creatures in the past. The fruit fly experiments have demonstrated scientifically that genetic mutations could not have produced the myriad of wonderful life forms that exist.

Another example is the whale exhibit at the Smithsonian Museum of Natural History. The ankle bone of a deer and the ankle bone of *Rodhocetus* are shown side-by-side with the following explanation: “Similar ankle bone assemblies in this deer and in early whales strongly indicate their ancestral

relationship.” Observe that they are assuming that *Rodhocetus* was a type of whale, whereas there is absolutely no scientific evidence for this. They are also assuming that similarity in some structure is evidence of evolution, when this, too, has never been demonstrated. Everything is presumed; no scientific evidence has been provided; no genetic model has even been imagined.

The second supposed evidence for whale evolution is the evolutionary naming system, whereby some extinct creatures are named “whales” and then used as evidence of evolution.

Consider the following statement from a biographical sketch of Phil Gingerich which was published prior to a 2007 lecture series at the University of Alabama: “He has done research on the phylogeny and origin of whales, including the discovery and description of the earliest known whale, *Pakicetus*, and the archaic whale, *Rodhocetus*...” (“UA Evolution Lectureship Series,” *UA News*, April 12, 2007).

In truth, there is no scientific evidence that either of these creatures were “whales.” They were put into the whale category on the basis of evolutionary assumptions, and having been named whales, they are now dogmatically stated to be such and are used as evidence of whale evolution! This is circular reasoning with a vengeance!

Evolutionary myths aside, consider how miraculous it would be for a wolf or a bear or any such creature to evolve into the 13 families and 79 species of whales, from the finless porpoise measuring about four feet long, to the blue whale measuring 100 feet. The latter weighs 360,000 pounds (the equivalent of 2,000 people); its tongue is the size and weight of an African elephant; its heart is the size of a small car; its heart pumps 2,640 gallons of blood; and a human could swim through its massive aorta (Carl Werner, *Evolution: The Grand Experiment*, Vol. 1. p. 40).

Dr. Duane Gish describes the incredible faith required to believe in the evolution of a whale from a land creature:

“Evolutionists are forced to believe that whatever the need may be, no matter how complex and unusual, random genetic errors were able to produce the structures required in a perfectly coordinated manner. ... It requires an enormous faith in miracles, where materialist philosophy actually forbids them, to believe that some hairy, four-legged mammal crawled into the water and gradually, over eons of time, gave rise to whales, dolphins, sea cows, seals, sea lions, walruses, and other marine mammals via thousands and thousands of random genetic errors. This blind hit and miss method supposedly generated the many highly specialized complex organs and structures without which these whales could not function, complex structures which in incipient stages would be totally useless and actually detrimental. Evolution theory is an incredible faith” (*The Fossils Still Say No*, pp. 206-208).

Consider the problem of the evolution of the whale’s diving ability.

“Bottlenose dolphins easily dive to depths of nearly 1200 feet. The beaked whale can dive to a depth of over 1600 feet. The largest of the toothed whales, the sperm whale (length about 65 feet and weight about 120,000 pounds) dives easily to 3,000 feet and can dive even to a depth of almost 10,000 feet, nearly two miles. In order to withstand the enormous pressures at such great depths, which even at depths of about 3,000 feet reach pressures almost 100 times that at sea level, the cranial and auditory apparatus of the whale must be very specially modified, including greatly increased vascularization of the ear. The sperm whale has a huge chamber containing several hundred gallons of sperm oil, or spermaceti, which alters according to depth and temperature to permit adjustment in buoyancy. Before diving, this whale goes through a ten-minute breathing exercise in order for its muscles, blood, and lungs to store oxygen. Its blood contains 50% more hemoglobin than human blood, and while humans use only 10-20% of their breathed air for energy, this

whale can utilize 80-90%. During a dive only 9% of its oxygen is derived from the lungs while 41% comes from blood and 50% from muscles and tissues” (Gish, *The Fossils Still Say No*).

In 2014, a Cuvier’s beaked whale with a satellite tag dived to 9,816 feet and stayed submerged for almost 2.5 hours (“This Mysterious Whale,” *Business Insider*, Mar. 26, 2014).

Consider the problem of evolving complex sonar equipment with the accompanying intelligence to interpret the signals:

“In order to help them ‘see’ at depths in the darkness, toothed whales are equipped with a sonar, or echolocation system. It is reported that they can hear sounds emitted under water from distances of sixty miles” (*The Fossils Still Say No*, p. 206).

Consider the problem of the change in the pelvis:

“One of the principal problems for Darwinians in whale evolution is constructing a pattern of events for the whale’s tail to emerge in small, naturally selected steps. The point is that the tail moves up and down, whereas in a land mammal it moves from side to side. This may sound a relatively small difference, but anatomically it is not. It means that somehow the whale’s ancestor had to get rid of its pelvis. ... According to Michael Pitman, a young Cambridge University biologist who has made a study of the problem, ‘every downward movement of such a tail would crush the reproductive opening of the creature against the back of the pelvis, causing pain and harm.’ ... Natural selection would work against, not for, such a change. So for the up-down action in whales to emerge, there simultaneously had to be random genetic changes that diminished the pelvis while allowing the tail to grow larger. Apart from the stupefyingly long odds against such a chain of events happening by chance, Pitman has concluded that there is a further anatomical objection. At a certain point in the supposed transitionary period, the hip bone would have been ‘too

small to support the hind legs and yet too large to permit the musculature necessary to move the great tail of the whale” (Francis Hitching, personal communication with Michael Pitman, *The Neck of the Giraffe*, p. 70).

Douglas Dewar, a fellow of the Zoological Society, says:

“Both whales and sea cows swim by the up and down movement of the great flattened tail. Such movement is impossible in a land animal that has a pelvis, but a well-developed pelvis is essential to every land animal which uses its hind legs for walking. ... I have repeatedly asked evolutionists to describe or draw the skeleton of a creature of which the pelvis and hind legs are anatomically midway between the state that prevails in whales and sea cows on the one hand, and a land quadruped on the other. No one has accepted the challenge, and of course a fossil of such a creature has not been found...” (“The Case Against Organic Evolution,” *Witnesses Against Evolution*, edited by John Meldau, 1968, p. 55).

Consider the problem of the baby whale:

“The babies of whales are born under water. If they were delivered in the way human babies are normally delivered--head first--they would not survive. All whales are born tail first. Baby whales must nurse under water. If they had to nurse in the usual way they would either drown or starve to death. No problem. The mammary glands of the mother whale are equipped with muscles which enable her to rapidly squirt the milk into the baby’s mouth under such pressure it would create a fountain above water six feet high. Her milk contains 42% fat and 12% protein, compared to 4.4% fat and 1% protein of human mother’s milk. A baby blue whale drinks about 200 pounds of milk daily, gaining about 175 pounds each day” (*The Fossils Still Say No*, p. 207).

The baby whale’s mouth fits snugly into its mother’s body so the sea water won’t get mixed with the milk, and its

windpipe is elongated above the gullet so milk cannot flow into its lungs (David Watson, *Myths and Miracles*, pp. 27, 28). “This design had to be perfect in both the mother and the baby whale from the very first time a baby whale was born and needed to nurse underwater.”

These are only a few of the problems inherent in evolving a wolf (or any other land creature) into a whale.

Another myth associated with the evolution of the whale is the alleged **VESTIGIAL “HIND LEGS.”**

Thomas Huxley said, “No doubt whales had hind legs once upon a time” (Adrian Desmond, *Huxley*, p. 347).

The following statement of the vestigial “hind leg” myth is from a biology textbook:

“Consider that normal sperm whales, like all whales, have small pelvic bones but no hind legs. A very small percentage of sperm whales, however, have vestigial leg bones, and some sperm whales even have bone-supported bumps protruding from their body. Whales probably are descended from an ancestor that lived on land. In the whales’ genome, many of the genes needed to make hind legs have been conserved, or have remained unchanged. In normal whales, the genes for hind legs are turned off. In rare cases, however, the genes are partially turned on, and vestigial hind legs form. Thus, whales and other living things may display their evolutionary history in the usually unexpressed genes they carry” (*Modern Biology*, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1999, p. 290).

The alleged “hind legs” are actually bones that are not attached to the whale’s skeleton. The whale has no sign of a pelvis or any other mechanism that has anything to do with actual vestigial legs. The bones in question strengthen the reproductive organs and are different in males and females.

Whale evolution is not science; it is a wild-eyed story.

Archaeopteryx and Bird Evolution

The accepted idea among evolutionists is that birds evolved from reptilian dinosaurs, and the *Archaeopteryx* has been used as a major icon of this transition for over a century.

Archaeopteryx is an extinct bird that has been preserved in amazing detail in a handful of fossils. It was the size of a typical “modern bird” and had feathered wings and a long feathered tail. Early on, Darwinists latched onto it as a missing link because of supposed “reptilian” features such as teeth, a long bony tail, and claws on its wings.

All seven of the major *Archaeopteryx* fossils were found in the same limestone quarry in Solnhofen, Germany, a quarry long famous for its beautifully-preserved fossils. The first specimen was found in 1861.

It was Thomas Huxley who proposed the dinosaur to bird evolution, and he used *Archaeopteryx* as the major piece of evidence for this myth. In his lectures Huxley had his students envision a “Jurassic past” when “tiny dinosaurs with long hind limbs passed by degrees into ancient flightless birds ... and these via *Archaeopteryx*’s kin into the song birds heralding today’s dawn” (Adrian Desmond, *Huxley*, p. 359).

Darwin with his bear-whale and Huxley with his dinosaur-bird had fantastic imaginations. Huxley mocked Bible Christianity as “blind faith,” but a bear turning into a whale and a dinosaur into a bird is pure science fiction.

Raging Controversy - No Consensus

Archaeopteryx has been the subject of heated controversy since its discovery. Paul Chambers, author of a history of the *Archaeopteryx*, says, “[It] has probably been at the centre of more bitterness and confrontation than any other single scientific object. This rancour began in 1961 and is just as vigorous today. ... The bitterness it engenders is, if anything, worse today...” (*Bones of Contention*, pp. ix, x).

Though evolutionists generally agree that birds evolved from dinosaurs in some fashion, there are competing theories. Some believe that birds evolved from *Archaeopteryx* or a similar creature. Others believe flying birds evolved from non-flying ostrich-like birds. Others believe that birds did not evolve directly from dinosaurs but that both evolved from a common ancestor. This very vocal group (which includes Alan Feduccia) is sometimes known by the acronym BAND, meaning Birds Are Not Dinosaurs. Others believe that birds evolved from a crocodile-like reptile.

There are two major theories about how birds evolved:

First, there is the “tree down” proposition, which says birds learned to fly by first learning to glide from trees.

Second, there is the “ground up” proposition, whereby birds evolved powered flight from the ground up.

The different groups have sometimes been at each other’s throats. “Speakers were shouted down at conferences and papers were blocked from publication ... I have even heard one person describe the opposite side as Nazis” (Chambers, pp. 192, 193).

When evolutionists treat fellow evolutionists in such a manner, it should be no surprise that they are so venomous toward creationists!

It’s Just a Bird

After over a century of brazen Darwinian hype in literature and museum displays, which have stated or implied that *Archaeopteryx* was some sort of missing link between dinosaurs and birds, the view that it is simply a bird is now becoming predominant.

This is true even though *Archaeopteryx* continues to be paraded before the public in textbooks and museums as a missing link. Consider, for example, the widely-distributed publication *Teaching about Evolution and the Nature of Science* (by the National Academy of Sciences, 1998) featured *Archaeopteryx* as the preeminent example of a missing link.

On page 8 is the following imaginary “dialogue” between teachers:

“Karen: A student in one of my classes at university told me that there are big gaps in the fossil record. Do you know anything about that?

“Doug: Well, there’s *Archaeopteryx*. It’s a fossil that has feathers like a bird but the skeleton of a small dinosaur. It’s one of those missing links that’s not missing any more.”

A mere four years later, Paul Chambers concluded his 2002 history of the *Archaeopteryx* with these words:

“Most now feel that the *Archaeopteryx* is actually a type of primitive bird rather than a feathered reptile or feathered dinosaur” (*Bones of Contention*, p. 253).

Alan Feduccia, world authority on birds, 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” (cited by V. Morell, “*Archaeopteryx*: Early bird catches a can of worms,” *Science*, Feb. 5, 1993, pp. 764-65).

Archaeopteryx had elliptically-shaped wings made of flying feathers with the avian barb-barbule system that ingeniously fastens the feathers together to allow for flight. Its feathers are asymmetrical in shape, meaning there are more filaments on one side of the central vane than the other, which is essential for flight (Paul Chambers, *Bones of Contention*, p. 217). Like the curved wing of an airplane, the asymmetrical shape of the bird’s wing provides lift. Only flightless birds have symmetrical feathers.

It had a moveable upper and lower jaw, unlike most reptiles which have only a moveable mandible or lower jaw (White and Comninellis, *Darwin’s Demise*, p. 81).

It had a large wishbone for attachment of muscles responsible for the down stroke of the wings (Jonathan Sarfati, *Refuting Evolution*, p. 59).

It was once thought that *Archaeopteryx* had solid bones like a reptile rather than thin and hollow bones like a bird, but it is now known that its bones were both thin and hollow.

A CT scan of the brain case of *Archaeopteryx* performed in 2004 found that the brain was like that of a modern bird. Its brain was larger than that of the typical dinosaur of the same body size and had large regions for vision (taking up nearly one-third of the brain), hearing, and muscle coordination. Also, the inner ear “more closely resembles that of modern birds than the inner ear of reptiles.” “These characteristics taken together suggest that *Archaeopteryx* had the keen sense of hearing, balance, spatial perception and coordination needed to fly” (L. Witmer, “Inside the Oldest Bird Brain,” *Nature*, 430(7000): 619-620; P. D. Alonso, et al, “The Avian Nature of the Brain and Inner Ear of *Archaeopteryx*,” *Nature*, 430(7000): 666-669).

Archaeoraptor: The Piltdown Bird

At a press conference on October 15, 1999, held by National Geographic, a fossil deemed *Archaeoraptor* was excitedly presented as the missing link between dinosaurs and birds.

The fossil, which was purchased by Stephen Czerkas for \$80,000 at an Arizona mineral show, appeared to be that of a toothed bird with a feathered dinosaur tail. It was supposedly found in a shale pit in China.

The November 1999 issue of *National Geographic* magazine featured a 10-page report entitled “Feathers for *T. rex*?” The article pontificated that the evidence for the evolution of birds from dinosaurs is now as certain as the fact that “humans are mammals.” It described dinosaurs “experimenting with flight.” *National Geographic* could not

resist publishing a drawing of the creature as a baby *Tyrannosaurus* with feathers.

The fossil was displayed at the National Geographic Museum in Washington D.C. and viewed by thousands of people.

It soon turned out, though, that *Archaeoraptor* was a myth built upon a fraud.

In October 2000, National Geographic admitted that the *Archaeoraptor* was a faked composite of different creatures. The head and upper body belong to an extinct bird called *Yanornis martini*. The tail belongs to a small, bipedal dinosaur called *Microraptor zhaoianus* that might have been a glider. The legs and feet had not been identified.

Supposedly, the composite fossil had been “accidentally” pieced together after being dropped, but to piece together portions of different shale fossils required a purposeful deception. It is obvious that it was fabricated by someone knowledgeable about what evolutionists expected the “missing link” to look like, and *National Geographic* was so eager to prove evolution true and to attract attention for the dinosaur-bird “theory” that they swallowed *Archaeoraptor* hook, line, and sinker.

Sinosauropteryx

An announcement was made in 1996 of a new “feathered fossil.” *Science* journal said that this “brings dinosaurs and birds closer.” *National Geographic* magazine published a report entitled “Feathered Dinosaur Fossils Unearthed in China.” The news made the *New York Times*.

The hoopla was over three fossils, *Archbeoraptor*, *Beipiaosaurus*, and *Sinosauropteryx prima* (SIEN-o-sawr-OP-ter-iks). (*Sinosauropteryx* means “Chinese dragon feather.”)

The fossils were found in the Liaoning Quarry in China.

The creatures were little theropod dinosaurs about four feet long from head to tail and weighing about five pounds.

They appeared to have “a mane of hair-like or feather-like structures” that ran along the spine and tail.

The rush to announce a missing link was again proven to be hasty and ill-advised. Upon closer examination, paleontologists announced that the “feathers” were not feathers after all. *Science* magazine ran an article called “Plucking the Feathered Dinosaur.” It reported:

“Exactly one year ago, paleontologists were abuzz about photos of a so-called ‘feathered dinosaur.’ ... The *Sinosauropteryx* specimen from the Yixian Formation in China made the front page of *The New York Times*, and was viewed by some as confirming the dinosaurian origins of birds. But at this year’s vertebrate paleontology meeting in Chicago late last month, the verdict was a bit different: The structures are not modern feathers, say the roughly half-dozen Western paleontologists who have seen the specimens. ... Paleontologist Larry Martin of Kansas University, Lawrence, thinks the structures are frayed collagenous fibers beneath the skin--and so have nothing to do with birds” (Ann Gibbons, “Plucking the Feathered Dinosaur,” *Science*, November 1997, pp. 1229–1230).

John Ostrom of Yale University described the “feathers” as “just a parallel array of fibers” (*New Scientist*, April 12, 1997).

Dr. Alan Feduccia said the “feathers” are collagen (“Do Feathered Dinosaurs Exist?” *Journal of Morphology*, Oct. 10, 2005, pp. 125-126, <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/112101271/PDFSTART>).

Evolutionary Assumption

Apart from evolutionary bias and presumption, there is zero scientific evidence that *Archaeopteryx* or any other of the proposed dino-birds are “missing links” on a path toward bird evolution.

What about the supposed “reptile” features? They no more prove that *Archaeopteryx* was an evolving dinosaur than a platypus’s duck bill proves that it is an evolving duck.

Francis Hitching, who is an evolutionist, says, "Every one of its supposed reptilian features can be found in various species of undoubted birds" (*The Neck of the Giraffe*, p. 21).

Dr. Jonathan Sarfati observes:

"The fact that it had teeth is irrelevant to its alleged transitional status--a number of extinct birds had teeth, while many reptiles do not" (*Refuting Evolution*, p. 59).

The *Archaeopteryx* is no problem for the Bible believer. God made all sorts of flying creatures. There are flying insects, flying reptiles, flying mammals (bats), and flying birds, and there are vast numbers of varieties of each.

In fact, Hermann von Meyer, the man who named *Archaeopteryx*, was a creationist who believed that the creature had nothing to do with evolution.

"I do not believe that God formed His creatures after the system devised by our philosophical wisdom. Of the classes of birds and modern reptiles as we define them, the Creator knows nothing, and just as little of a prototype, or of a constant embryonic condition of the bird, which might be recognised in the *Archaeopteryx*. The *Archaeopteryx* is of its kind just as perfect a creature as other creatures, and if we are not able to include this fossil in our system, our short-sightedness is alone to blame" (von Meyer, cited by Chambers, *Bones of Contention*, p. 98).

No Scientific Explanation for Such an Amazing Change

Evolutionists have never provided scientifically-feasible evidence of how a reptile could change into a bird.

Darwinists focus on a few supposed "reptilian" characteristics of the *Archaeopteryx* while ignoring the vast amount of fantastic modification that would be required to turn a reptile into a bird.

Following are just some of these:

A heavy earth-bound body would have to evolve into a light-weight, aerodynamic one. Alan Feduccia of the University of

North Carolina at Chapel Hill, an evolutionist who is a world authority on birds, says:

“It’s biophysically impossible to evolve flight from such large bipeds [hind legs] with foreshortened forelimbs and heavy, balancing tails” (quoted by A. Gibbons, “New Feathered fossil Brings Dinosaurs and Birds Closer,” *Science*, 1996, cited from White and Comninellis, *Darwin’s Demise*, p. 82).

Solid bones would have to evolve into hollow bones that are light but incredibly strong.

Scales would have to evolve into complex flight feathers. A “simple” pigeon feather is composed of more than one million individual parts made up of billions of cells perfectly organized into a marvel of design. The flight feather is an amazingly complex system with the following three major features (adapted from Burgess, p. 39):

- a hollow stem containing air or foam, which starts out as a circle near the root of the feather and changes into a rectangular shape which is structurally stronger
- barbs angle off of the stem forming the basic feather shape
- two sets of barbules angle off of the barbs, with one set of barbules having hooks that interlock with a set of non-hooked barbules; there can be hundreds of thousands of barbules in one feather

With the barbules hooked, the wing has a lightweight flat surface that the bird uses to push against the air. The barbules prevent air from passing through the wing on the downward motion while allowing air to pass through on the wing’s upward motion.

Michael Pitman, who taught biology at Cambridge, describes the marvelous design of the flight feather:

“Some large feathers contain over a million barbules, with hooks and eye-lets to match, in perfect order. The feather is useless without this interlocking mechanism which acts

something like an automatic zip fastener whose disturbance preening rearranges. When outstretched in flight, the hooks cause the whole wing-assembly to form a continuous sheet to catch the wind. The whole feather is a cohesive, elastic and light structure, well-designed to function as an air-resistant surface. Sensory receptors record its precise position. Over both wings they effect the continuous variations and fine adjustments of more than ten thousand tiny muscles attached to the bases of the feathers. Behold the parts of a precious instrument of aerospace, unparalleled in design and workmanship by human technology” (*Adam and Evolution*, p. 222).

Oxford University professor Richard Dawkins has made a name for himself by spewing out hatred toward the God of the Bible and saying all sorts of ridiculous things. One of the silliest is that “feathers are modified reptilian scales” (*Climbing Mount Improbable*, 1996, p. 113).

Right. There’s barely any difference to speak of, except that scales are folds in the skin, whereas “feathers are complex structures with a barb, barbules, and hooks [that] originate in a totally different way, from follicles inside the skin in a manner akin to mammalian hair” (Jonathan Sarfati, *Refuting Evolution*, p. 64). Dr. Sarfati adds, “For scales to have evolved into feathers means that a significant amount of genetic information had to arise in the bird’s DNA which was not present in that of its alleged reptile ancestor.”

Bellows-like lungs would have to evolve into the avian sac-like lungs.

“Bird respiration involves a unique ‘flow-through ventilation’ into a set of nine interconnecting flexible air sacs sandwiched between muscles and under the skin. The air sacs contain few blood vessels and do not take part in oxygen exchange, but rather function like bellows to move air through the lungs. The air sacs permit a unidirectional flow of air through the lungs resulting in higher oxygen content than is possible with the bidirectional air flow through the lungs of reptiles and

mammals. ... The unidirectional flow through bird lungs not only permits more oxygen to diffuse into the blood but also keeps the volume of air in the lungs nearly constant, a requirement for maintaining a level flight path” (*The New Answers Book 1*, pp. 300, 301).

Dr. Jonathan Sarfati also describes the vast difference between the reptilian and the avian breathing systems.

“Drastic changes are needed to turn a reptile lung into a bird lung. Reptile lungs work like bellows, the air is drawn in, and the stale air is then breathed out the same way it came in. In the lung, blood extracts the oxygen and releases carbon dioxide on the surfaces of ingrowths called *septa* (singular *septa*). But birds have a complicated system of air sacs, even involving the hollow bones. This system keeps air flowing in one direction through special tubes (*parabronchi*, singular *parabronchus*) in the lung, and blood moves through the lung’s blood vessels in the opposite direction for efficient oxygen uptake, an excellent engineering design. How would the ‘bellows’-style lungs of reptiles evolve gradually into avian lungs?” (*Refuting Evolution*, pp. 66, 67).

Michael Denton, Ph.D. in biochemistry from King’s College, London, observes:

“Just how such a different respiratory system could have evolved gradually from the standard vertebrate design is fantastically difficult to envisage, especially bearing in mind that the maintenance of respiratory function is absolutely vital to the life of an organism to the extent that the slightest malfunction leads to death within minutes. Just as the feather cannot function as an organ of flight until the hooks and barbules are coadapted to fit together perfectly, so the avian lung cannot function as an organ of respiration until the parabronchi system which permeates it and the air sac system which guarantees the parabronchi their air supply are both highly developed and able to function together in a perfectly integrated manner” (*Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*).

Lymph fluid would have to evolve into blood.

An egg with a leathery cover would have to evolve into an egg with a hardened calciferous shell.

A reptile would have to change into a mammal.

Dr. Jonathan Sarfati lists some of the differences between the mammal and the reptile:

- Mammals have a different circulatory system, including red blood cells without nuclei, a heart with four chambers instead of three and one aorta instead of two, and a fundamentally different system of blood supply to the eye.
- Mammals produce milk, to feed their young.
- Mammalian skin has two extra layers, hair and sweat glands.
- Mammals have a diaphragm, a fibrous, muscular partition between the thorax and abdomen, which is vital for breathing. Reptiles breathe in a different way.
- Mammals keep their body temperature constant (warm-bloodedness), requiring a complex temperature control mechanism.
- The mammalian ear has the complex organ of Corti, absent from all reptile ears.
- Mammalian kidneys have a 'very high ultrafiltration rate of the blood.' This means the heart must be able to produce the required high blood pressure. Mammalian kidneys excrete urea instead of uric acid, which requires different chemistry. They are also finely regulated to maintain constant levels of substances in the blood, which requires a complex endocrine system (*Refuting Evolution*, p. 56).

A land-bound reptile brain would have to evolve into an avian brain capable of thriving in a completely different environment.

A creature that can only grunt or squeal or croak would have to evolve the ability to sing pretty songs.

This would require the evolution of the two sets of membranes that are located in the songbird's syrinx (voice box) so that it can produce independent sounds of two voices at once.

“Birds vocalize with the syrinx, a sound-producing organ located at the junction of the two bronchi at the base of the trachea. These two bronchial sides can actually be stimulated independently, so they can each produce different sounds at the same time, as happens in the clear, flutelike song of the Wood Thrush” (*Bird Songs: 250 North American Birds in Song*, foreword by Jon Dunn, p. 6).

Birds can take mini-breaths that are so brief and so perfectly synchronized with their songs they do not produce any discernible gaps.

Some birds transpose songs from one key to another. Some, such as the eastern whipbird and the buff-breasted wren, sing duets. Some birds engage in countersinging and antiphonal singing, with one bird singing part of a song and another bird singing another part. This requires knowledge of the duet by both partners and split-second timing in its execution. Some birds even sing matched duetting in a group of four. “Three or more birds sing--males, then females, then males, and so on--to produce what sounds like a single melody.”

A creature that lives and dies in one place would have to evolve the ability to migrate long distances.

The Arctic Tern migrates more than 9,000 miles from the Arctic to the Antarctic. An Alaskan bar-tailed godwit that was tracked with a satellite tag flew 6,800 miles in one eight-day flight (www.plosbiology.org). The golden plover migrates from Alaska to Hawaii, unerringly finding a tiny island in the middle of the Pacific Ocean after a journey of 3,000 miles. The whimbrel migrates non-stop 3,500 miles from the Southampton Island in Canada's Arctic to the mouth of the Amazon River in Brazil. One whimbrel that was tagged with a radio transmitter flew through Hurricane Irene when it was a category 3 storm and survived (“Bird Migrates through Hurricane Irene,” *USA Today*, August 28, 2011). The bar-headed goose migrates over the Himalayan mountains, flying more than five and a half miles high where there is little

oxygen. The ruby-throated hummingbird flies non-stop 450 miles across the Gulf of Mexico in 20 hours, beating its tiny wings nearly 3 million times on that amazing journey.

And this amazing reptile-to-bird evolutionary process, which is blind and non-intelligent and directionless, would have to produce 24 orders of birds from eagles to woodpeckers to swans to penguins to hummingbirds!

Career biology instructor Kenneth Poppe observes:

“Try to imagine the incredible numbers of oddball species necessary to bridge the gaps between any lizard and any bird. It takes a most active imagination to conjure even a hypothetical fossil record. For example, describe the anatomy of an intermediate species that transitions from cold- to warm-blooded, which a reptile would have to do en route to becoming a bird. Considering the specificities and complexities of both metabolic systems, any type of ‘half and half’ would be something out of poorly done science fiction” (*Reclaiming Science from Darwinism*, p. 218).

The Croco-bird

An even more ridiculous idea, if that is possible, held by some scientists, is that birds evolved from the *crocodylomorpha* or an ancient type of “terrestrial crocodile.”

At a conference in Bavaria in September 1984, this view was put forth as one of the possible paths of bird evolution. The textbook *Understanding Biology through Evolution* by Bruce Olsen calls crocodiles and birds “cousins” and claims that both evolved through the *archosaur* (“ruling lizard”).

Though attempts have been made to describe how a crocodile could become a bird, even the most ardent evolutionists have to admit that they “cannot as yet offer any plausible explanation for the origin of the unique shaft, barbs, and barbules without which modern feathers would have neither aerodynamic nor insulatory function” (Regal, *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, 1975, p. 35).

That could be the mother of all understatements! We have already seen some of the amazing physical changes that would be necessary for a dinosaur of any type to evolve into a bird.

At the genetic level, there are billions of things that would have to change to turn a crocodile into a bird. As the biochemist Dr. Duane Gish observes, “What makes such stories or scenarios so incredible is the belief of evolutionists that whatever is needed will be produced by genetic change or mutations, which are totally random with no particular end in view” (*Evolution: The Fossils Still Say No*, p. 104).

Further, what motivation could a crocodile have in becoming a bird? He is already perfectly adapted (one could even say “designed”) for his earth-bound environment.

Was he discontented? Did he have a secret wish to fly? Where would such a strange impulse come from? If it were an outside force that moved him in that direction, what was that force? Blind evolution? The “law” of natural selection? Aliens? Gaia? Magic?

And all along the evolutionary trail from croc to bird, if this actually happened, the poor croco-bird would have developed things that would be of no use to him in his natural environment, and would, in fact, have been absolute hindrances. I am thinking of things such as a half wing. Try running around with half a wing hanging from your side! Try building a crocodile nest with little bird feet! Try breathing when your breathing apparatus has begun to morph into a completely different system!

And let's suppose that somehow and for some reason the crocodile developed every necessary part of the flying equipment and survived the torturous path of existing as a part-croc, part-bird, who would teach him how to fly? There would have been no birds to imitate, because this fellow was supposedly the first bird. How many attempts would the croco-bird have to make before he got airborne? Maybe he climbed a tall tree (a crocodile that can learn to fly can

doubtless climb a tree) and practiced gliding for a while in order to get the hang of it. Why would a crocodile want to jump out of a tree? Why didn't it hurt itself and just quit such nonsense long before anything productive happened? Sooner or later the croco-bird had to have taken off on his own. Maybe he found an incline and ran as fast as his little croco-bird feet could go and got airborne that way, kind of like the Wright Brothers at Kitty Hawk. Just what was that first croco-bird flight like? Wouldn't it have been something to see!

Once the croco-bird got off the ground, what would he do? Would a flying crocodile be afraid of height?

Evolutionists would argue, perhaps, that they don't believe that birds evolved from a modern crocodile but from an extinct kind. O.K. Take any old type of crocodile you want, big or small, terrestrial or aquatic, and the scenario is the same.

No wonder science fiction has been so closely associated with evolution. (See the report "Beware of Science Fiction" at the Way of Life web site.)

Darwin: Look for Countless Intermediaries

A few questionable fossils proffered as missing links do not prove evolution. As Charles Darwin said, his doctrine requires the existence of *COUNTLESS* intermediaries.

Phillip Johnson observes:

"if we are testing Darwinism rather than merely looking for a confirming example or two, then a single good candidate for ancestor status is not enough to save a theory that posits a worldwide history of continual evolutionary transformation" (Philip Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, p. 81).

What If Some Dinosaurs Had Feathers?

The "evidence" that some dinosaurs had feathers is highly questionable, but what if some type of dinosaur creature did have feathers?

As Ken Ham observes:

“What if a dinosaur fossil was found with feathers on it? Would that prove that birds evolved from dinosaurs? No, a duck has a duck bill and webbed feet, as does a platypus, but nobody believes that this proves that platypuses evolved from ducks. The belief that reptiles or dinosaurs evolved into birds requires reptilian scales on the way to becoming feathers, that is, transitional scales, not fully formed feathers. A dinosaur-like fossil with feathers would just be another curious mosaic, like the platypus, and part of the pattern of similarities placed in creatures to show the hand of the one true Creator God who made everything” (*The New Answers Book 1*, p. 173).

The Forgery Theory

In 1986 Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickrasinghe, professors of astronomy, published a book proposing that the *Archaeopteryx* fossils are forgeries. The title was *Archaeopteryx -- The Primordial Bird: A Case of Fossil Forgery*. Based on a first-hand study of the fossil at the Natural History Museum in London, Hoyle and Wickramasinghe concluded that feathers had been added to the fossil of a small dinosaur.

Many creationists have accepted this theory, but in our estimation the subsequent discovery of more fossils (the sixth and seventh) of *Archaeopteryx* with feathers puts it to rest. The sixth specimen was found in November 1987 in the collection of Friedrich Muller, former mayor of Solnhofen, and today resides in the Burgermeister Muller Museum in Solnhofen (Chambers, p. 208). It has faint impressions of feathers.

Mythical Evolutionary Art

The dino-bird hypothesis has been most successfully promoted as an icon of evolution via the use of mythical art.

The drawings and models of dino-birds in books and museums are a great deception. Without supporting evidence, features are added to dinosaurs to make them look bird-like and the resulting mythical creations are presented as

icons of evolution to an unsuspecting public. Even some evolutionists have protested this practice.

“In an open letter to the National Geographic society, Dr. Storrs Olson, a Smithsonian Institute evolution scientist, has referred to the practice of adding features to dinosaurs as **‘propaganda, hype, wishful thinking, melodramatic, nonsense, spurious, fantasia, and a hoax.’** He wrote, ‘... the idea of featured dinosaurs and the theropod origin of birds is being actively promulgated by a cadre of zealous scientists acting in concert with certain editors at *Nature* and *National Geographic* who themselves have become outspoken and highly biased proselytizers of the faith. **Truth and careful scientific weighing evidence have been among the first casualties in their program, which is now fast becoming one of the grander scientific hoaxes of our age**” (letter dated November 1, 1999, cited from the documentary *Evolution: The Grand Experiment*).

Proavis

Gerhard Heilmann's *The Origin of Birds* (1926) featured a life-like picture of *Proavis*, the supposed missing link. It is depicted with both scales and feathers and is shown climbing a tree and gliding through the air like a flying squirrel. This is pure myth. There is no fossil evidence for such a creature, but it fit Heilmann's "tree-down" proposition that dinosaurs first developed the ability to glide before they developed powered flight. Heilmann hated God and the Bible. His 1940 book *The Universe and Tradition* is "peppered with anti-religious feelings."

In spite of its mythical character, "the impact of Heilmann's book cannot be exaggerated" (Chambers, p. 163). That is no doubt true. Only the Lord can calculate how many people have been influenced to believe in evolution and thus to disbelieve the Bible because of deceptive evolutionary art.

Bambiraptor

Bambiraptor was unveiled in 1995 as the latest evidence for dinosaur to bird evolution. The well-preserved fossil was found in Montana and looks like a *Velociraptor*, which is a chicken-sized *T. rex*.

The skeleton and a reconstruction were exhibited at the 2000 Florida Symposium on Dinosaur Bird Evolution. Brian Cooley's reconstruction magically transformed the bare skeleton into a bird-like dinosaur, with bird-like eyes in bird-like orientation, bird-like leg muscles, even pretty bird feathers! (See *Icons of Evolution*, p. 129.)

Jonathan Wells makes the important observation that "nothing remotely resembling feathers was found with the fossil" (*Icons of Evolution*, p. 128).

The Australia Museum in Sydney has an exhibit "proving" the evolution of dinosaur to bird. One display case features *Bambiraptor*, *Archaeopteryx*, and a pheasant. The *Bambiraptor* is running, looking for all the world as if it is trying to get off the ground, while the *Archaeopteryx* is flying level, not far off the ground above the *Bambiraptor*, perhaps a bit unsteadily as a newcomer to flight, with the pheasant soaring easily above its supposed evolutionary predecessors.

This is myth perpetrated through evolutionary art and the fanciful placement of skeletons.

Junk DNA

A modern spin on the vestigial organ argument is so-called "junk DNA." This argument is used by Darrel Falk in *Coming to Peace with Science*, and by others.

Humans supposedly share non-functional ("junk" or "gibberish") DNA with apes and other species, and this is used as evidence for a shared evolutionary ancestry.

The refutation of this is the same as that of the older vestigial organ argument: *IT'S NOT JUNK!*

Gretchen Vogel said, “The term ‘junk DNA’ is a reflection of our ignorance” (“Why Sequence the Junk?” *Science*, Vol. 291, Feb. 16, 2001, p. 1184).

John Mattick observes, “The failure to recognize the importance of introns [so-called junk DNA] may well go down as one of the biggest mistakes in the history of molecular biology” (quote by W. Wayt Gibbs, “The Unseen Genome,” *Scientific American*, Vol. 289, Nov. 2003, pp. 49-50).

Casey Luskin says:

“... in 2010, we’re seeing more and more that such ‘junk’ DNA arguments are factually weak because a myriad of functions have been discovered for non-coding DNA. As Helen Pearson put it in *Nature* a couple of years ago, scientists are finding that ‘DNA previously written off as junk actually carries biological information’ (“Codes and Enigmas,” *Nature*, Nov. 16, 2006).

“The fact that ‘junk’ DNA arguments for common ancestry are made by some highly-credible scientists doesn’t mean the arguments are good ones--it just shows how deeply these views have penetrated into the evolutionary scientific community. ...

“Dr. Falk relies heavily upon the argument that introns are ‘gibberish’ DNA that we share with other species at the same [genetic] position, and this supposedly demonstrates common ancestry. The problem for the argument is that introns are not ‘gibberish,’ but have important functions, such as regulating gene expression. And if there’s function, then a perfectly valid explanation for the functional genetic similarities we see is common design, not necessarily common descent. ...

“Dr. Falk’s book was published in 2004. A stark admission of the false assumption that non-coding intronic DNA is useless genetic ‘gibberish’ was highlighted in a 2003 article in *Scientific American* titled, ‘The Unseen Genome: Gems Among the Junk.’ ... The article summarizes John

Mattick's view with these striking words: 'The failure to recognize the importance of introns may well go down as one of the biggest mistakes in the history of molecular biology.' Yet that is what Dr. Falk does in *Coming to Peace with Science* by repeatedly calling introns 'gibberish.' ...

"An insightful 2003 paper in *Science* talks about how the evolutionary assumption that repetitive DNA has no function has actually hindered the progress of cellular biology: 'Although catchy, the term junk DNA for many years repelled mainstream researchers from studying noncoding DNA. ... the view of junk DNA, especially repetitive elements, began to change in the early 1990s. Now, more and more biologists regard repetitive elements as a genomic treasure' (Wojciech Makalowski, "Not Junk After All," *Science*, May 23, 2003). ...

"The bottom line is that the 'junk' or 'gibberish' DNA paradigm is being consistently overturned as time goes on, and we now know that the vast majority of our DNA has function" ("Does Darrel Falk's Junk DNA Argument for Common Descent Commit 'One of the Biggest Mistakes in the History of Molecular Biology'?" *Evolution News and Views*, Discovery Institute, March 23, 2010).

Following are some other quotes about the functionality of so-called junk DNA, and these could be multiplied:

"Noncoding RNAs (ncRNAs) have been found to have roles in a great variety of processes, including transcription regulation, chromosome replication, RNA processing and modification, messenger RNA stability and translation, and even protein degradation and translocation. Recent studies indicate that ncRNAs are far more abundant and important than initially imagined" (Gisela Storz, "An Expanding Universe of Noncoding RNAs," *Science*, Vol. 296, May 17, 2002, p. 1260).

"There's been a quiet revolution taking place in biology during the past few years over the role of RNA," says Dr. Alexandre Akoulitchev, a Senior Research Fellow at the

University of Oxford. "Scientists have begun to see 'junk' DNA as having a very important function. The variety of RNA types produced from this "junk" is staggering and the functional implications are huge."

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2007/01/070121162811.htm>

"Large swaths of garbled human DNA once dismissed as junk appear to contain some valuable sections, according to a new study by researchers at the Stanford University School of Medicine and the University of California-Santa Cruz. The scientists propose that this redeemed DNA plays a role in controlling when genes turn on and off."

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2007/04/070423185538.htm>

"In a region of DNA long considered a genetic wasteland, HMS researchers have discovered a new class of gene. Most genes carry out their tasks by making a product--a protein or enzyme. This is true of those that provide the body's raw materials, the structural genes, and those that control other genes' activities, the regulatory genes. The new one, found in yeast, does not produce a protein. It performs its function, in this case to regulate a nearby gene, simply by being turned on."

http://focus.hms.harvard.edu/2004/June4_2004/genetics.html

"Researchers at the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine have discovered that introns, or junk DNA to some, associated with RNA are an important molecular guide to making nerve-cell electrical channels."

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2008/02/080205115800.htm>

The Huxley-Wilberforce Debate

The Wilberforce-Huxley "debate" of 1860 is one of the great iconic myths that evolutionists have created to support

their boast that evolution has won over the Bible and Christianity.

On June 30, 1860, there was a meeting at Oxford University of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. This was only months after the publication of Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species*, and interest in the subject was intense.

Darwin did not attend, but the Darwinian position was represented by "Darwin's bulldog" Thomas Huxley, who stood that day for Darwin's cause not because he believed Darwin's "theory" of natural selection but because he had a fiery hatred of biblical creationism. Years later Huxley said of Bible-believing scientists who resisted Darwinism, "I should like to get my heel into their mouths and scr-r-unch it round" (Lord Ernie, "Victorian Memoirs and Memories," *The Quarterly Review*, 1923, 239 (475): 224, cited from Ian Taylor, *From the Minds of Men*, p. 363).

The most formidable challenger to Darwin on this occasion was Samuel Wilberforce, an Anglican bishop and the son of the famous William Wilberforce, abolisher of the slave trade.

The evolutionary myth has it that Wilberforce was defeated before Huxley in a hands-down manner and that with this defeat creationism and Christianity, too, were left in tatters.

Supposedly Wilberforce addressed Huxley and asked whether it was through his grandfather or his grandmother that he claimed descent from a monkey. Obviously intended as a joke, Huxley took the occasion to retort that he would rather have an ape for a grandfather than an ignorant bishop.

There are many myths about this encounter.

First, there is the myth that Wilberforce was an old buffoon blindly defending the Bible and Christianity on the basis of mere tradition. In evolutionary accounts of this event, Wilberforce is typically called by the nickname "Soapy Sam." Supposedly he was "slick" like soap, but this is not a respectful term for a church leader and is used by his

detractors in an obvious attempt to lower the man's esteem in the eyes of readers.

In fact, Wilberforce had a serious Christian piety ("his diary reveals a tender and devout private life," *New World Encyclopedia*). He was deeply concerned about social issues, having inherited from his famous father a hatred of slavery. He was also a brilliant man and an able naturalist (one who studies nature). His arguments that day were not based on the Bible but on science and morality, and they were directed at the tremendous weaknesses of Darwin's "theory".

Wilberforce stated his position as follows:

"... we have objected to the views with which we are dealing solely on scientific grounds. We have done so from our fixed conviction that it is thus that the truth or falsehood of such arguments should be tried. We have no sympathy with those who object to any facts or alleged facts in nature, or to any inference logically deduced from them, because they believe them to contradict what it appears to them is taught by Revelation" (Benjamin Wiker, *The Darwin Myth*, p. 102).

Wilberforce's presentation that day was based on his published review of Darwin's *Origin*. He "was quite well read in science, and brought just the kinds of objections against Darwin's doctrine that other eminent scientists were offering. These were, of course, the very objections that Darwin feared, as they pinpointed the weak spots of his theory" (Wiker, p. 101).

"The review contained very carefully argued points showing that in view of the known stability of species, Darwin had not made out his case in supposing that one species could be transmuted into another. Darwin acknowledged the cogency of this critical review article as, 'uncommonly clever: it picks out with skill all the most conjectural parts, and brings forward well the difficulties' (F. Darwin, *Charles Darwin, Life and Letters*,

1887, Vol. 2, p. 324)” (Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 364).

Wilberforce was deeply concerned about the moral consequences of Darwinism. For one thing, he believed it would weaken the cause of abolition by giving ammunition to those who viewed Negroes as inferior. This concern was noble and perfectly reasonable in light of Darwin’s “theory” of “the survival of the fittest” and his racist views that Negroes and aboriginals were inferior and would eventually be destroyed. Darwinism was the best gift ever given to a slaver. Darwin’s book *On the Origin of Species* was subtitled “The preservation of favored races in the struggle for life,” and he was not referring merely to animals. Consider the following statement that Darwin made in *The Descent of Man*:

“At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilized races of man will almost certainly exterminate and replace throughout the world the savage races. At the same time the anthropomorphos apes ... will no doubt be exterminated. The break will then be rendered wider, for it will intervene between man in a more civilized state, as we may hope, than the Caucasian, and some ape as low as a baboon, instead of as at present between the negro or Australian and the gorilla.”

From this quote we see that Darwin looked upon the Negro and the Australian aborigine as just a little higher on the evolutionary scale than the gorilla, and he calmly predicted they would be exterminated. *Exterminated!*

The real reason that Wilberforce was hated by the Darwin-Huxley clan was that he was an effective public figure who stood forcefully against the skepticism that they represented.

“Church liberals hated Wilberforce’s hard line, as he condemned their softpedalling on miracles. He castigated the ‘seven against Christ’, the liberal Anglican contributors to the innocent-sounding *Essays and Reviews*, whose critique of [Genesis] and biblical

literalism inflamed more passions in a year than Darwin managed in a lifetime. ... Wilberforce drew up a petition declaring that ‘the whole Canonical Scriptures’ was the literal ‘Word of God’” (Adrian Desmond, *Huxley*, pp. 278, 328).

Wilberforce was hated because his opposition to theological liberalism was effective. His petition “in favour of biblical inspiration and eternal torments” was signed by 11,000 Anglican clergy and resulted in the condemnation of the liberal *Essays and Reviews* at the Convocation of Canterbury in 1861.

Second, there is the myth that Wilberforce was trying to “savage” Huxley that day.

In fact, Wilberforce’s reference to Huxley’s parentage was a joke. Even Adrian Desmond, the extremely sympathetic biographer of Darwin and Huxley, says that “the bishop, after two hours of boring speeches in a stuffy room, tried to lighten the proceedings with a joke that palpably missed the mark” (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 495). It was Huxley, full of hatred toward the Bible and its “parsons” and far too thin skinned, who made “a mountain out of a molehill.”

Third, there is the myth that Huxley’s retort was the highlight of the meeting.

In fact, there is evidence that few even heard it. Joseph Hooker told Darwin that he had entered the discussion because “he was afraid that Huxley’s voice had not carried well” (Gertrude Himmelfarb, *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution*, p. 292).

Fourth, there is the myth that Huxley was on the side of Darwinism that day because he actually believed it.

In fact, Huxley didn’t believe in Darwin’s “theory” of natural selection, which was the prominent point in *On the Origin of Species*. Huxley believed that the fossil record demonstrated that animals appeared suddenly and remained

the same form throughout time. Had he not been on a personal vendetta against God, Huxley would have joined Wilberforce that day in arguing against Darwinism!

Fifth, there is the myth that Huxley's arguments persuaded the majority of the crowd.

Darwin's most serious biographers debunk this.

Gertrude Himmerfarb observes:

"In fact, most of the clergy remained unmoved ... Probably the effect of the meeting was less to shift sentiment than to harden it, to intensify party strife among those already endowed with party spirit" (*Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution*, p. 293).

Adrian Desmond adds, "Perceptions of the event differed so wildly that talk of a 'victor' is ridiculous" (*Huxley*, p. 280), and, "Wilberforce went away happy that he had given Huxley a bloody nose, while many in the crowd adjudicated it an entertaining draw" (*Darwin*, p. 497).

Even Huxley acknowledged that the crowd was predominantly hostile to his party following the meeting.

What is true is that the meeting represented a major changing of the times, and it is rightfully an icon of the great battle fought in the last half of the 19th century between God and skepticism, creation and evolution, the Bible and theological modernism.

The most outspoken proponent for the Bible that day might have been Robert Fitz-Roy, Darwin's old captain from the *H.M.S. Beagle*. At the time of the debate, Fitz-Roy, now an admiral, was head of England's Meteorological Department and was at Oxford to give a paper on storms.

"With military bearing the Admiral, 'lifting an immense Bible first with both and afterwards with one hand over his head, solemnly implored the audience to believe God rather than man.' He admitted that *Origin of Species* had given him 'acute pain.' It was a sad sight as the crowd shouted him down" (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 495).

Fitz-Roy is frequently ridiculed by Darwinists, but he was right. We should believe God rather than man. In this present dark world, rushing pell-mell toward apocalypse, truth is shouted down, but the Bible will ultimately triumph because it is indeed the Word of the eternal, almighty God. Jesus warned that the road to destruction is broad, whereas the road to life is narrow (Matthew 7:13-14), so we are not surprised to find truth in the extreme minority at the present time.

The Scopes Trial

The Scopes trial of 1925 is a major evolutionary icon, allegedly proving that evolution has won over the Bible and Christianity, but the way it is typically presented is a myth. In particular, the 1960 Hollywood movie *Inherit the Wind* starring Spencer Tracy is a cheap propaganda piece.

In *History of Modern Creationism*, Dr. Henry Morris observed that “the Scopes trial was evolution’s great triumph...” (p. 76).

Dr. Morris said that when he spent six weeks speaking on creationism in New Zealand in 1973, the government-controlled television broadcast *Inherit the Wind* repeatedly in each city he visited (*History of Modern Creationism*, p. 77).

The trial was held to determine whether John Scopes was guilty of teaching evolution in a public school classroom contrary to Tennessee state law. (The law forbade a state-funded educational establishment to teach “any theory that denies the story of the Divine Creation of man as taught in the Bible, and to teach instead that man has descended from a lower order of animals.”)

The trial was arranged as a showcase by the American Civil Liberties Union in their agenda to dethrone the Bible from a position of authority in American society. It was a major milestone in man’s end-times rage against Almighty God and His holy law (Psalm 2:1-3).

“The idea of the Scopes Monkey Trial of 1925 in Dayton, Tennessee, seems to have been hatched in New York by officers of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). The legal defence, which hired famous criminal lawyer Clarence Seward Darrow, was arranged and paid for by the ACLU and members of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The ACLU released to the Tennessee newspapers a call for a teacher who would break the 1925 state law against teaching evolution” (Michael Pitman, *Adam and Evolution*, p. 99).

Clarence Darrow was a profane, philandering man who was willing to use any cheap trick to defend the guilty. (He was tried twice for jury tampering and bribery. Acquitted through the efforts of an equally slick lawyer, Earl Rogers, Darrow was forbidden to practice law in California.)

But Darrow was not selected merely because he was a clever lawyer. He was a committed Darwinist, an atheist who said, “I don’t care about the book above.” The weekly meetings of the Evolution Club congregated in his Chicago home. The portraits of his heroes decorating the walls of his office included Karl Marx (Hal Higdon, *The Crime of the Century*). A year before the Scopes Trial, Darrow had defended the wealthy teenage killers Nathan Leopold and Richard Loeb who admitted to murdering 14-year-old Bobby Franks just for “a sort of pure love of excitement.” On a lark to commit the perfect crime, the 19-year-old young men said, “It was just an experiment. It is as easy for us to justify as an entomologist in impaling a beetle on a pin” (Higdon). Leopold and Loeb were atheistic Darwinists, heavily influenced by the “God is dead” philosopher Frederick Nietzsche and by Darwin’s foremost German disciple Ernst Haeckel. Leopold said, “There is no difference between the death of a man and the death of a dog” (Higdon). Though the young men snickered through the trial and showed absolutely no remorse for their vile crime, Darrow saved them from the death penalty with the philosophy of

Darwinist determination and natural selection. In his closing speech at the sentencing hearing, Darrow denounced the “old theory” that man has a free will and is accountable for his actions, which he called a “barbarous and cruel” view, calling for its replacement with a new, enlightened view of modern science that “human beings are machines determined wholly by their heredity and environment” (John West, *Darwin Day in America*, p. 46). He even painted Leopold and Loeb as victims of the tragedy, because they killed Bobby only “because they were made that way.” Darrow went so far as to say that blame can never be fixed on human actions, because “every influence, conscious and unconscious, acts and reacts on every living organism.”

If Darwinian evolution is true, Darrow was correct in extrapolating this deterministic philosophy, and Leopold and Loeb were right in comparing the murder of a human being with the impaling of a beetle on a pin. Can a monkey make a moral choice? If man is merely an evolved bacterium, there could not possibly be ultimate meaning to life or an absolute basis for blame and punishment. Are termites morally accountable if they weaken the structure of a house and it collapses, killing the occupants?

Leopold and Loeb’s heinous crime was definitely a product of Darwinism. As Erle Stanley Gardner, lawyer and author of the Perry Mason novels, observed: “Loeb and Leopold were merely the first bits of flotsam carried along by a swift stream, which had originated deep in the springs of changing thought and which was destined to rise to flood. Those muddy waters are still rising, and the flotsam being swept along in increasing quantities is frightening” (cited from Higdon, *The Crime of the Century*, chapter 13).

On the other aisle at the Scopes trial was William Jennings Bryan, a three-time presidential candidate and outspoken defender of the Bible, who assisted with the prosecution.

The trial was a great media event. It was covered by more than 200 reporters who wrote about two million words.

Sixty-five telegraph operators “sent out more words to Europe and Australia than had ever before been cabled about any American event” (R. M. Cornelius, *Scopes: Creation on Trial*, p. 10). It was the first trial to be broadcast nationally on radio (by station WGN in Chicago).

Most of the reporting was highly biased against creationism. It was “specifically designed to destroy creationism and the fundamentalist revival which reached its climax in this media event” (Morris, p. 70). When asked why he never attended the trial sessions, one reporter answered, “Oh, I don’t have to know what’s going on; I know what my paper wants me to write” (Warren Allem, *Backgrounds of the Scopes Trial*, p. 92).

The image typically portrayed of William Jennings Bryan is of a sincere but bumbling and not very intelligent man, but this is nonsense. Bryan was called “The Great Commoner” because he had a heart for the common man and a gift of communicating truth in a simple way, but he was a very intelligent, studious man.

The book *In His Image* (1922) contains the James Sprunt Lectures that Bryan delivered at Union Theological Seminary. The very invitation to deliver these prestigious lectures is evidence of Bryan’s intellectual stature. Previous lectures had been delivered by such men as J. Gresham Machen and G. Campbell Morgan. Bryan delivered a carefully-reasoned presentation on such questions as the existence of God, the divine inspiration of the Bible, and the soul of man. From a reading of these lectures, it is obvious that he was an intelligent, well-read man.

In his discussion of Darwinism, Bryan made the following observation:

“But the Darwinian doctrine is more dangerous because more deceptive. It permits one to believe in a God, but puts the creative act so far away that reverence for the Creator--even belief in Him--is likely to be lost” (*In His Image*, p. 90).

That is a brilliant observation.

It is obvious that Bryan had read Darwin's two major works and had understood them. His critique is devastating. Consider this:

"Darwin does not use facts; he uses conclusions drawn from similarities. He builds upon presumptions, probabilities and inference, and asks the acceptance of his hypothesis 'notwithstanding the fact that connecting links have not hitherto been discovered.' He advances an hypothesis which, if true, would find support on every foot of the earth's surface, but which, as a matter of fact, finds support nowhere" (*In His Image*, p. 91).

Bryan described the vacuity of Darwin's arguments perfectly.

The reason that Bryan was so hated by evolutionists in his day was that his arguments against Darwinism were effective. The same was true for Samuel Wilberforce before him.

At the same time, Bryan made a serious error in holding to the day/age theory and thus allowing for the possibility of millions of years of time for creation to occur.

"Probably the most serious mistake made by Bryan on the stand was to insist repeatedly that he had implicit confidence in the infallibility of Scripture, but then to hedge on the geological question, relying on the day/age theory. He had been warned against this very thing by George McCready Price. Darrow, of course, made the most of it, ridiculing the idea of people claiming to believe the Bible was inspired when its meaning was so flexible that one could make it say whatever he wished" (Morris, *The History of Modern Creationism*, p. 73).

Though evolutionists try to portray Bryan and all Bible believers as ignorant people, blindly following a mythical religion, it was actually the evolutionists at the trial that introduced myths into the court record and were later proved

to be complete fools (though I have never seen this reported by the mainstream media).

Nebraska Man and Piltdown Man were mentioned in affidavits by “expert witnesses” Fay-Cooper Cole and Horatio Newman (professors at the University of Chicago), and Judge Raulston allowed their reports to be read into the court record on July 20, 1925.

These alleged ape-men fossils were offered as evidence of evolution.

Nebraska Man had been announced in 1922 by Henry Osborn, president of the American Natural History Museum. In June of that year, the popular and influential *Illustrated London News* published a two-page black and white drawing of Nebraska Man based on collaboration with Grafton Elliot Smith of the British Natural History Museum. The drawing depicts Mr. and Mrs. Nebraska Man. They are stooped and naked, human in body but somewhat ape-like in the face. The brutish caveman holds a club while his “wife” holds some small animal while looking at the male with a very stupid expression on her unattractive ape face. A couple of months before the Scopes Trial, Henry Osborn wrote that Nebraska Man “constitutes infinitesimal but irrefutable evidence that the man-ape wandered over from Asia into North America” (*The Forum*, May 1925).

It turned out that Nebraska Man was based upon a single tooth that was later found to belong to a pig, and not even an extinct one!

As for Piltdown Man, this missing link turned out to be a complete hoax. Doctored fragments of a 500-year-old human skull, an orangutan jawbone, and a couple of chimpanzee teeth “discovered” in the Piltdown gravel pit in Sussex in 1912 were accepted by experts at the British Museum and elsewhere as an ancient ape-man. It was given the scientific name of *Eoanthropus dawsoni* (“Dawson’s dawn-man”) in honor of its discoverer Charles Dawson (who probably perpetrated the hoax). For 40 years, Piltdown Man was

broadcast throughout the world as a major evidence of evolution and used to silence Bible believers. A plaster reconstruction was given a prominent place in the British Museum of Natural History. Drawings, paintings, and statues of Piltdown proliferated. The one by Louis Rutot, titled “Man of Sussex,” depicted Piltdown as an ape-man (a half-ape, half-human head on a hairy human body) making a crude tool. Piltdown was adopted into textbooks, described in encyclopedias, represented at museums, introduced as evidence in the Scopes Trial, and discussed in hundreds of articles and scientific papers. Arthur Woodward of the British Museum devoted an entire book, *The Earliest Englishman*, to Piltdown. Finally in 1953, the British Museum announced that the “fossils” had proven to be fabricated.

Even though the Scopes Trial was won by the creationists (John Scopes pled guilty of teaching evolution contrary to state law) and even though the evidence for evolution introduced at the trial turned out to be bogus, the trial had the dramatic effect of furthering evolution and “intimidating Christians.”

“Multitudes of nominal Christians capitulated to theistic evolution, and even those who retained their belief in creation retreated from the arena of conflict” (Morris, *The History of Modern Creationism*, p. 74).

The ACLU’s role in the Scopes trial is telling. Whereas in 1925 they sued to allow the teaching of evolution in America’s public schools, pretending that they only wanted freedom of expression in education, in 2000, in the case of *Kitzmiller v. Dover*, they sued to *prevent* the teaching of an alternative to evolution (intelligent design). The back cover of Jonathan Wells’ *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Darwinism and Intelligent Design* states:

“Why did the ACLU turn from defending the free-speech rights of Darwinists to silencing their opponents? Jonathan Wells reveals that, for today’s Darwinists, there

may be no other choice: unable to fend off growing challenges from scientists, or to compete with rival theories better adapted to the latest evidence, Darwinism—like Marxism and Freudianism before it—is simply unfit to survive.”

Proteinoids

A recent attempt to explain the origin of proteins is the proteinoid hypothesis.

The following is from *Evolution: The Grand Experiment*, Volume 1:

“Since proteins are necessary for life, scientists who support evolution want to know how proteins may have formed naturally. They believe that life, in the form of a single-cell organism, began in the ocean billions of years ago. Yet, it has been shown that water prevents amino acids from linking together to form a protein.

“Scientists studying the origin of life were initially discouraged with the prospect of not knowing how proteins formed, but now they think they have a breakthrough. By taking dried amino acids and super heating them to 300 degrees Fahrenheit, they have produced an unnatural congealing of amino acid links, which they call a ‘proteinoid.’

“Scientists who support evolution believe proteinoids, which may have acted like proteins, came first and then eventually converted to proteins by an unknown mechanism. Advocates of evolution have also suggested that the process of heating dried amino acids to form on the heated surface of a volcano. They postulate that the heat of the volcano caused the amino acids to congeal. Later, rain washed these proteinoid chemicals back into the ocean at which point they interacted with DNA and other chemicals floating in the water and eventually formed the first living organism” (Carl Warner, M.D., *Evolution: The Grand Experiment*, Vol. 1, pp. 200, 201).

Proteinoids form things called microspheres. *The Modern Biology* textbook says:

“Sidney Fox (1912-) and others have done extensive research on the physical structures that may have given rise to the first cells. These cell-like structures, like the ones shown in Figure 14-7, form spontaneously in the laboratory from solutions of simple organic chemicals. The structures include microspheres, which are spherical in shape and are composed of many protein molecules that are organized as a membrane, and coacervates (coh-AS-uhr-vayts), which are collections of droplets that are composed of molecules of different types, including linked amino acids and sugars. ... Structures such as these may have enclosed replicating molecules of RNA and may have been the forerunners of the first cells” (*Modern Biology*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1999, p. 268).

Observe that this biology textbook claims that proteinoids MAY have given rise to the first cells and MAY have enclosed replicating RNA, but there is no scientific evidence for this. It is speculation and wishful thinking on the part of those who are searching for a naturalistic origin of life scenario. The fact is that proteinoids and microspheres are not living, are not formed as a product of DNA or RNA information processing, and do not replicate. They are as distinct from RNA as death is from life.

Observe, too, that proteinoids are said to “form spontaneously” with the implication that they could form naturally, but this is only more guessing. In reality, they are products of intelligent minds using modern laboratory equipment.

On page 204 of *Evolution: The Grand Experiment*, volume 1, Dr. Carl Werner lists the following criticisms of proteinoids:

1. A proteinoid has never been shown to convert into a protein. [The language used by evolutionists to describe proteinoids is often imprecise, in that they are said to be

proteins or protein-like. In reality they are “protein-like” only in a very loose way. Unlike proteinoids, proteins are extremely complex things, strung together and folded with great precision for predetermined functions, and they are produced only by living cells.]

2. Dried, purified amino acids used to form proteinoids do not occur in nature.

3. To be created, proteinoids depend upon investigator interference.

4. Heating amino acids to 300 degrees Fahrenheit to form a proteinoid destroys any proteins in the area since most proteins denature at such high temperature.

5. Proteinoids do not resemble proteins.

6. Proteins are assembled mainly with left-handed amino acids, the ‘L’ form, in nearly all living organisms today. ... This is a problem because proteinoids are composed of approximately equal numbers of left- and right-handed amino acids.

7. Proteinoids have not been shown to carry out any of the essential functions of complex proteins that would be necessary for the first cell, such as copying DNA, assisting in the formation of other proteins, and energy management.

Archaeobacteria

Archaeobacteria is a name given to bacteria that live in extreme environments such as extreme heat or salt concentration. They are called archaeobacteria from the evolutionary assumption that they might have been the earliest types of living things.

John Kramer, Ph.D. in biochemistry and a fellow at the Hormel Institute, has identified, characterized, and synthesized the structure of numerous food, bacterial, and biological components and has published 128 scientific papers. He says:

“... to view these bacteria as earlier and simpler forms of life is totally misrepresenting their complexity. These bacteria are just as complex as mammalian cells, and represent an amazing design suited for the extreme conditions of temperature and salt concentration. Each cell is produced according to the information in its respective DNA. Attempts to give these complex lipid structures common names containing the prefix ‘archae,’ to denote their evolutionary hierarchy, does not provide scientific evidence. It states one’s belief, but adds no scientific knowledge. In fact, it may even be misleading by implying that lipid structures and energy mechanisms may evolve differently under different environmental conditions. The evidence shows that *Methanobacteria thermoautotrophicum* remain *Methanobacteria thermoautotrophicum* through millions of generations, according to their genetic information, and growing under favorable conditions of high temperature and salt concentration” (*In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, p. 49).

Bacterial Resistance

Another icon widely used as evidence for evolution is bacterial resistance to antibiotics. For example, the *Staphylococcus* bacterium builds resistance to penicillin. This is said to prove that bacteria evolved by adapting to their environment.

In fact, there is no addition of genetic information involved in this process and therefore no support for evolution. This is another example of the evolutionist’s bait and switch tactic. They use the term “evolution” to describe simple adaptability within a species and then use this to prove that species to species “evolution” is possible. The former can be proven, while the latter is a presumption. No matter what type of resistance it develops and adaptations it makes, the bacterium remains bacterium.

Consider two of the major ways that bacteria achieve immunity to antibiotics.

First, some of the bacteria within a certain strain already have immunity to a certain antibiotic. Since these bacteria are not killed they multiply, while those lacking the immunity die out. Lee Spetner, Ph.D. in physics from MIT and a professor of biophysics at Johns Hopkins, observes:

“The acquisition of antibiotic resistance in this manner ... is not the kind that can serve as a prototype for the mutations needed to account for Evolution. ... **The genetic changes that could illustrate the theory must not only add information to the bacterium's genome, they must add new information to the biocosm. The horizontal transfer of genes only spreads around genes that are already in some species**” (“Lee Spetner/Edward Max Dialogue,” 2001, www.trueorigin.org/spetner2.asp).

A few years ago the bodies of three Arctic explorers who died in 1845 were recovered. “Samples of bacteria were taken from their intestines and it was found that some of the bacteria were indeed resistant to modern-day antibiotics. This is just as the creation scientist would predict. There have always been some populations of bacteria that have had genes conferring a resistance to antibiotics” (Alan Gillen, *Body by Design*, p. 141).

Second, some bacteria gain immunity by a loss of genetic information. Dr. Lee Spetner gives the example of bacteria that become immune to streptomycin by the decomposition of the ribosome in its cell due to a destructive mutation.

“This change in the surface of the microorganism's ribosome prevents the streptomycin molecule from attaching and carrying out its antibiotic function. It turns out that this degradation is a loss of specificity and therefore a loss of information. The main point is that Evolution ... cannot be achieved by mutations of this sort, no matter how many of them there are. Evolution cannot be built by accumulating mutations that only

degrade specificity” (“Lee Spetner/Edward Max Dialogue,” 2001, www.trueorigin.org/spetner2.asp).

Far from being a genetic advance for the bacterium, the degradation causes it to become less functional.

At the end of the day, bacteria are bacteria, regardless of a resistance to antibiotics. Nothing has ever been scientifically observed that would demonstrate that bacteria could evolve into something else.

Reproductive Isolation

Reproductive isolation is proposed as a means of species evolution. According to this proposition, species can evolve when a group of animals is isolated by topography or some other means. When this occurs, various traits can occur within the isolated group, such as different colorings or size.

An example is the *Heliconius erato* butterfly in the Amazonian and Central American rain forests. This forest was once an immense jungle the size of the European continent, but it has been chopped up through human habitation and activity. As a result, varieties of the butterfly have “evolved” with different colorings and markings.

Another example is the Kaibab squirrel and the Abert squirrel. These inhabit the north and south sides of the Grand Canyon. There are extremely minor differences between the squirrels, but they are thought to represent one squirrel species that became separated due to the formation of the canyon.

Darwinism proposes that the isolation phenomenon can lead to increasingly greater changes that could eventually produce new types of animals.

The problem with this is that there is no evidence that such minor changes can produce new types of organs and creatures. It is pure speculation based on evolutionary assumption. The varieties of *Heliconius erato* butterfly are all

butterflies and the varieties of Grand Canyon squirrels are all squirrels.

The “Imperfect” Human Eye

Another icon of evolution is the supposed imperfection of the human eye. This is used in an attempt to refute the design principle of creationism. It is said that the retina is backwards, because the cones and rods are installed behind nine layers of cells and light must therefore first pass through these layers.

Richard Dawkins makes the following claim:

“Any engineer would naturally assume that the photocells would point towards the light, with their wires leading backwards towards the brain. He would laugh at any suggestion that the photocells might point away, from the light, with their wires departing on the side nearest the light. Yet this is exactly what happens in all vertebrate retinas. Each photocell is, in effect, wired in backwards, with its wire sticking out on the side nearest the light. The wire has to travel over the surface of the retina to a point where it dives through a hole in the retina (the so-called ‘blind spot’) to join the optic nerve. This means that the light, instead of being granted an unrestricted passage to the photocells, has to pass through a forest of connecting wires, presumably suffering at least some attenuation and distortion (actually, probably not much but, still, it is the principle of the thing that would offend any tidy-minded engineer). I don’t know the exact explanation for this strange state of affairs. The relevant period of evolution is so long ago” (*The Blind Watchmaker*, p. 93).

In *Life’s Grand Design*, Ken Miller also calls the human eye a “flawed design” and claims that the cephalopod (octopus) eye is superior.

The Darwinist charge that the human eye is wired backward is answered by scientists in the following articles.

George Marshall, Ph.D. in Ophthalmic Science from Glasgow University and Sir Jules Thorn, Lecturer in Ophthalmic Science at Glasgow, “An Eye for Creation: An Interview with Eye-disease Researcher Dr. George Marshall,” *Creation*, September 1996, <http://www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v18/i4/eye.asp>

“The light-detecting structures within photoreceptor cells are located in the stack of discs. These discs are being continually replaced by the formation of new ones at the cell body end of the stack, thereby pushing older discs down the stack. Those discs at the other end of the stack are ‘swallowed’ by a single layer of retinal pigment epithelial (RPE) cells. RPE cells are highly active, and for this they need a very large blood supply—the choroid. Unlike the retina, which is virtually transparent, the choroid is virtually opaque, because of the vast numbers of red blood cells within it. For the retina to be wired the way that Professor Richard Dawkins suggested, would require the choroid to come between the photoreceptor cells and the light, for RPE cells must be kept in intimate contact with both the choroid and photoreceptor to perform their job. Anybody who has had the misfortune of a hemorrhage in front of the retina will testify as to how well red blood cells block out the light.

“The notion that the eye was wired backward occurred to me as a 13-year-old when studying eye anatomy in a school science class. It took me two years of lecturing on human eye anatomy to realize why the eye is wired the way it is. The idea that the eye is wired backward comes from a lack of knowledge of eye function and anatomy” (George Marshall).

Dr. Peter W. V. Gurney, “Is Our ‘Inverted’ Retina Really ‘Bad Design’?” *Technical Journal*, April 1999, <http://www.answersingenesis.org/tj/v13/i1/retina.asp>

In the following excerpt Dr. Gurney answers the charge that the octopus’ eye is wired correctly as opposed to the human eye:

“Some evolutionists claim that the verted retinae of cephalopods, such as squids and octopuses, are more efficient than the inverted retinae found in vertebrates. But this presupposes that the inverted retina is inefficient in the first place. As shown above, evolutionists have failed to demonstrate that the inverted retina is a bad design, and that it functions poorly; they ignore the many good reasons for it.

“Also, they have never shown that cephalopods actually see better. On the contrary, their eyes merely ‘approach some of the lower vertebrate eyes in efficiency’ and they are probably colour blind. Moreover, the cephalopod retina, besides being ‘verted’, is actually much simpler than the ‘inverted’ retina of vertebrates; as Budelmann states, ‘The structure of the [cephalopod] retina is much simpler than in the vertebrate eye, with only two neural components, the receptor cells and efferent fibres’. It is an undulating structure with ‘long cylindrical photoreceptor cells with rhabdomeres consisting of microvilli’, so that the cephalopod eye has been described as a ‘compound eye with a single lens’. The rhabdomeres act as light guides, and their microvilli are arranged such that the animal can detect the direction of polarized light—this foils camouflage based on reflection.

“Finally, in their natural environment cephalopods are exposed to a much lower light intensity than are most vertebrates and they generally live only two or three years at the most. Nothing is known about the lifespan of the giant squid; in any case it is believed to frequent great depths at which there is little light. Thus for cephalopods there is less need for protection against photic damage. Being differently designed for a different environment, the cephalopod eye can function well with a ‘verted’ retina” (“Is our ‘inverted’ retina really ‘bad design?’” *Technical Journal*, April 1999, <http://www.answersingenesis.org/tj/v13/i1/retina.asp#r49>).

Dr. Alan Gillen also comments:

“There are excellent functional reasons for human photoreceptors to be oriented in front. A critical tissue, the retinal pigment epithelium (RPE) that is located beneath the retina, maintains photoreceptor structure and function. The RPE recycles photopigments, removes spent outer segments of the photoreceptors, provides an opaque layer to absorb excess light, and performs additional functions. The RPE is a fully functional tissue for the eye and must be located in back of the retina’s photoreceptor cells in order to obtain optimal vision. If all the wiring and support vessels were behind the retina, this would leave no room for the RPE. ... The RPE must lie between the choroid and the bipolar cells, so the human eye is not flawed. Rather, the conclusions of evolutionary biologists have demonstrated flawed thinking not a flawed design. Cephalopod eyes are extremely nearsighted, somewhat colorblind, and unlikely to form sharp images as our eyes can. The cephalopod has eyes designed for life in the deep oceans. The human eye, like the eyes of other vertebrates, has vision that is superior to cephalopods” (*Body by Design*, p. 99).

I would challenge Richard Dawkins and other evolutionists who say that the human eye is imperfect to create a better one.

We demonstrate how utterly amazing the human eye is in the section on “Icons of Creation.”

DNA Similarity Between Apes And Men

Evolutionists today claim that human DNA is 96 to 98 percent the same as that of the ape, supposedly proving that we are closely akin. (The statistic 96% is given by Francis Collins, former head of the Human Genome Project, in his book *The Language of God*.)

1. This claim is deeply suspect on its very head, since man is so obviously and so vastly different from apes.

Dr. David Berlinski observes:

“Simian social structures are often intricate. Chimpanzees, bonobos, and gorillas reason; they form plans; they have preferences; they are cunning; they have passions and desires; and they suffer. The same is true of cats, I might add. **In much of this, we see ourselves. But beyond what we have in common with the apes, we have nothing in common, and while the similarities are interesting, the differences are profound**” (*The Devil’s Delusion*, p. 156).

2. In fact, the claim is an unproven assumption.

The following is from “Genetic Monkey Business,” *Creation Moments*, Sept. 5, 2010:

“Now geneticists have begun to examine this claim. Researchers recently completed the first detailed map of one chimpanzee chromosome. That alone should tell us that the claim of genetic similarity between humans and chimps has never been proven. They then compared this with the corresponding human chromosome. In a detailed examination they found 68,000 small differences in the DNA between the two genes. An analysis of the 231 genes of this chromosome showed that 83 percent of them would make proteins that differed from one another. They noted that if this pattern held for all the comparisons between human and chimpanzee genes, they would expect thousands of differences. In other words, rather than humans and chimps being more than 98 percent genetically identical, so far they have proven to be 83 percent genetically different!”

A recent study has shown that the Y chromosome is very different between men and apes:

“We now know that the human and chimp Y chromosomes are highly dissimilar. The new research shows significant differences particularly between the male-specific regions of the human and chimp Y chromosomes--the MSYs. Unlike the prediction of highly conserved genomes over the 6 million years since the two species split apart, the new results indicate a ‘wholesale

renovation' and 'remodeling' in the respective lineages. Little change was predicted but what has been found is that more than 30% of the chimpanzee MSY region has no human counterpart, and vice-versa. Furthermore, the human and chimp regions are not in the same order. Contrary to what was expected, 'the chimpanzee and human MSYs differ markedly in sequence structure' reflecting 'extensive rearrangement.' In all, the chimp and human Y chromosomes are 'horrendously different from each other,' said one evolutionist" ("Human-Chimp Genomic Differences," May 20, 2010, *Darwin's God* blog).

3. Even if humans were only different from apes in four percent of their DNA, that is still a massive amount of genetic difference.

Four percent of human DNA would be equivalent at the very least to the information contained in forty 500-page books. And let's not forget about all of that so-called "junk DNA"!

4. Since humans and apes live in the same general environment and share similarities in bodily form, it is reasonable that there are significant DNA similarities.

Dr. Gary Parker says:

"You would expect a lot of similarities between a man and chimpanzee. We breathe the same air. We have muscles and bones. We digest things similarly. If we were created by the same God we would expect to have lots of similarities" (*A Question of Origins*, video presentation, Eternal Productions).

5. DNA comparisons become extremely strange and ultimately meaningless.

For example, there is more DNA variation between different types of frogs than there is between the bat and the blue whale (Richard Milton, *Shattering the Myths*, p. 184).

And humans supposedly share 99% of our genes with the mouse (James Le Fanu, “The Last Days of the Façade of Knowing,” *Evolution News & Views*, June 7, 2010).

6. The evolutionist assumes that materialism is everything and that to understand DNA is to understand everything about man, but the greatest difference between the human and the ape is intellectual and spiritual, which are characteristics that lie beyond examination with a microscope.

The Bible says that man is the only creature on earth made in God’s image. He has an eternal soul. He can communicate with God and can obey or disobey God’s moral laws. He can fall but he can also be redeemed.

Talking Apes

Reports appear frequently in evolutionary publications purporting that some animal has learned to do this or that, thus supposedly offering proof for evolution. Apes are the favorite vehicles for this research. It has even been claimed that apes have been taught to use human language.

Two of the most famous ape training trials featured a chimpanzee named Lana (the LANguage Analogue Project) and a gorilla named Koko.

J. L. Mistler-Lachman and R. Lachman say that Lana “has not been shown to use language by any criterion strong enough to exclude rats, worms, or any other conditionable animal” (*Science* 185:871, 1974, cited from Duane Gish, *Persuaded by the Evidence*, p. 312).

Another trial was conducted by Herbert Terrace at Columbia University featuring a chimpanzee named Nim Chimsky. The name was a pun on Noam Chomsky, an MIT professor who believed that “human language appears to be a unique phenomenon, without significant analogue in the animal world (*Language and Mind*, p. 68).

Though Terrace set out to challenge Chomsky's thesis, he eventually concluded that Chomsky was right.

"While Nim did learn 125 signs, Terrace concluded that he hadn't acquired anything the researchers were prepared to designate worthy of the name 'language' (as defined by Noam Chomsky) although he had learned to repeat his trainers' signs in appropriate contexts. Language is defined as a 'doubly articulated' system, in which signs are formed for objects and states and then combined syntactically, in ways that determine how their meanings will be understood. For example, 'man bites dog' and 'dog bites man' use the same set of words but because of their ordering will be understood by speakers of English as denoting very different meanings. 'For one thing, they say, there's no syntax – a basic requirement of language. **Without combining words and then being able to switch combinations to change meaning, goes the argument, what animals use is more like a code than a language**' ['Beasts of Banter,' *The Columbus Dispatch*, March 16, 2008]. One of Terrace's colleagues, Laura-Ann Petitto, estimated that with more standard criteria Nim's true vocabulary count was closer to 25 than 125. ... **Terrace argued that none of the chimps were using language, because they could learn signs but could not form them syntactically as language, as described above.** ... Terrace and his colleagues concluded that the chimpanzee did not show any meaningful sequential behavior that rivaled human grammar. Nim's use of language was strictly pragmatic, as a means of obtaining an outcome ... There was nothing Nim could be taught that could not equally well be taught to a pigeon using the principles of operant conditioning" ("Nim Chimpsky," *Wikipedia*).

Thomas Sebeok, who has analyzed the ape language studies, concludes:

"In my opinion, the alleged language experiments with apes divide into three groups: one, outright fraud; two,

self-deception; three, those conducted by Terrace. The largest class by far is the middle one" (N. Wade, "Does Man Alone Have Language," *Science*, 208, 1349-1351, 1990).

The bottom line is that while apes have been taught to understand and respond to some sign language and spoken English, they have never been trained to talk or read or write or reason or invent *IN A HUMAN FASHION*. At the end of the most extensive, intelligently-designed training program, the ape is still a dumb ape and the vast gulf between animal and human is never breached.

It is not surprising that animals can understand some human instructions and respond to human training because they were created to be under human authority. This fits the Bible's account of creation and could be predicted by any Bible believer.

It should be said, further, that there is no evidence that animals in the wild learn the things that intelligent humans teach them in controlled settings.

"Many animals can be trained by humans to do exotic things that they would never do in the wild. That has absolutely nothing to do with evolution. Instead, it seems to be a principle of nature that a being of higher intelligence can teach a being of lower intelligence to do things that it would never do if left to itself. This is simply a residual effect of the dominion that God gave humans over animals at creation (Gen. 1:26, 28)" (Marvin Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, p. 313).

Michael Pitman, who taught biology at Cambridge, observes:

"It is true that, given a human teacher, animals may come to understand words and sign language as well as gestures and tones of voice. Apes are intelligent, sensitive creatures which respond to human affection. But this does not mean that, any more than parrots, they would by themselves have developed complex symbol-systems. It

does not make them potential humans, any more than their humanoid form need have inexorably evolved into man. Only theory requires that.

“[Apes] cannot construct syntactic sentences with different permutations of the same words. In contrast, by the age of five children with no special training can construct syntactical language. They can answer simple questions dealing with space and time, the measurement of heat, differences in size and weight, comparatives and superlatives, regular and irregular verb forms, pluralizations, active and passive moods, past and future tenses and much more” (*Adam and Evolution*, pp. 244, 245).

Dr. David Berlinski adds:

“After years of punishing trials, a few of them have been taught the rudiments of various primitive symbol systems. Having been given the gift of language, they have nothing to say. When two simian prodigies meet, they fling their signs at one another. ... beyond what we have in common with the apes, we have nothing in common, and while the similarities are interesting, the differences are profound” (*The Devil’s Delusion*, p. 156).

Dawkins’ Typing Monkeys

In his reply to the creationist argument that complex proteins cannot be produced by chance, Richard Dawkins uses the example of monkeys typing the following line from Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*,

METHINKS IT IS LIKE A WEASEL

This string of characters has 23 letters and 5 spaces, a total of 28 different characters that must be placed in exact sequence.

Dawkins claims that if a monkey typed long enough or if letters could otherwise be selected by chance, such as via a

computer program, that this exact line would eventually be produced.

Following are some observations on this claim:

1. This only happens when Dawkins is allowed to sneak intelligence into the allegedly random operation.

He proposes a computer program that operates something like a slot machine with a window for 28 positions. After a few tries, some letters are bound to appear in the right place, such as the following:

bEkfoylzgiTsoltyEApmgrkh

Here the E, T, E, and A appear in the right place, and under Dawkin's scheme THEY ARE HELD IN PLACE while the other slots are spun repeatedly. As the correct letters and spaces appear, THEY ALSO ARE HELD IN PLACE, while the process continues until all of the correct letters and spaces appear.

Dawkins calls the holding in place "cumulative selection" (*The Blind Watchmaker*, p. 49).

This is not blind evolution; it is intelligent design! Dawkins says, "Natural selection is the blind watchmaker, blind because it does not see ahead, does not plan consequences, has no purpose in view" (p. 21).

Who or what, then, would be doing the selecting? How could an unintelligent chance process with no specific goal in mind know what letters and spaces to hold?

Career biology teacher Kenneth Poppe observes:

"What, or who, knows to hold any letter or space in place when it begins to come close, or even lands in the desired position? What is to keep from sending a hopeful letter or space into reshuffle on the next pull? For certain, Dawkin's computer program has some type of instructions intended to recognize target letters. In Las Vegas, if you could keep every 'cherry cluster' in a slot machine window where it appeared before your next pull, legendary jackpots would hit much more often than every

forty-third yank on the handle. ... how can a completely random process proceed toward a target sequence as if it knows where it is going? If natural evolution is truly a 'blind watchmaker,' how can it possibly know the preconceived destinations that perfectly make each of the approximately 100,000 different proteins that will someday have to fully interact to make life?" (*Reclaiming Science from Darwinism*, p. 107).

2. Even if some purely random process could create a line of Shakespeare, how would a blind process recognize what it had created or know what to do with it?

3. Even if some purely random process could create a line of Shakespearean, that would be mere child's play compared to creating the living cell or any living structure--such as the seeing eye, the hearing ear, and the flying wing--through random processes.

4. A monkey trial was actually conducted by the British National Council of Arts.

A computer was placed in a cage with six monkeys for one month. They produced 50 typed pages but not a single word (Antony Flew, *There Is A God*, p. 76). They also pooped all over the computer. Israeli scientist Gerry Schroeder calculated that the chances of monkeys typing just one Shakespearean sonnet is 10 to the 690th power, whereas there are only 10 to the 80th power of atoms in the entire universe (Flew, p. 77).

The Peacock's Tail Feather

Evolutionists have had a love/hate relationship with the peacock's tail feathers.

On the one hand, Charles Darwin said, "The sight of a feather in a peacock's tail, whenever I gaze at it, makes me feel sick" (*The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, 1887, Vol. II, p. 296).

That is because the peacock's tail is a marvel of beauty and design that cries out against evolution and "natural selection."

The bird has about 200 tail feathers, of which 170 are "eye" feathers and 30 are "T" feathers. They are arrayed in a perfect variety of length and size to create a stunning artistic display. One large peacock feather can contain 20 MILLION barbule segments that zip the feathers together.

The brilliant colors displayed in the peacock tail are not made from pigment. They are made by a "thin-film interference" that reflects light in precise ways to create the bright, iridescent colors. This is caused by three ultra-thin layers of keratin of perfect thickness and placement that cause a precise portion of the light wave to be reflected to create various colors. The keratin layers vary in thickness to create various colors and shades of color.

The intricate eye pattern is formed by the precise arrangement of the two million barbs and barbules that make up that segment of the peacock tail and by the way that they vary in reflective color. "The abrupt change in the optical properties of keratin is an amazing feature because it involves a sudden and precise change in the structure of the barbule. Even more amazingly, along the length of the barb, the optical retardation in the keratin does not continually increase (or decrease) but both increases and decreases" (Stuart Burgess, *Hallmarks of Design*, p 84).

Darwin was also discouraged at the sight of the peacock's tail feather because it is unreasonable to assume that natural selection would choose such a thing. Obviously a brilliant array of feathers does not help the peacock survive by blending into its environment nor does the cumbersome thing help it fly more efficiently.

In an attempt to explain the peacock's tail feathers, Darwin and his followers resorted to the myth of sexual selection, and this has become something of an icon.

For example, *Biology: The Dynamics of Life*, a textbook published by Merrill, 1991, stated,

“The peacock has a most obvious behavioral adaption for attracting mates” (p. 210).

There are devastating problems with this idea, though.

1. It is an evolutionary assumption without a shred of scientific evidence to back it up, though it has been presented as established fact.

2. Sexual selection, even if were true, does not explain how such an amazingly complex structure could have arisen in the first place.

“The usual explanation is ‘sexual selection’, where genes for a structure are passed on preferentially because the other sex happens to like that structure when choosing a mate. However, this doesn’t explain the origin of the precisely coordinated mutations required to form the tail, quite aside from why females would select for beauty and even how they could do so. So it is quite understandable that even some evolutionists now speak of the accumulated ‘fatal problems’ of sexual selection theory, referring to case studies showing it ‘is always mistaken’ and therefore ‘needs to be replaced’ [Roughgarden, J., Oishi, M. and Akcay, E. “Reproductive social behavior: cooperative games to replace sexual selection,” *Science* 311 (5763):965-969, 2006, and Catchpoole, D., “Peacock poppycock?” *Creation* 29 (2): 56, 2007; creationtheweb.com/poppycock].

3. Research has found that the female has no interest in the peacock’s tail feathers.

“Indeed, new research has empirically damaged this theory, by showing that peahens aren’t impressed with the peacock display, and care more for the mating calls. The researchers summarize their seven-year study:

‘We found no evidence that peahens expressed any preference for peacocks with more elaborate trains (i.e. trains having more ocelli, a more symmetrical arrangement or a greater length), similar to other studies

of galliforms showing that females disregard male plumage. Combined with previous results, our findings indicate that the peacock's train (1) is not the universal target of female choice, (2) shows small variance among males across populations and (3) based on current physiological knowledge, does not appear to reliably reflect the male condition" [Takahashi, M. et al. "Peahens do not prefer peacocks with more elaborate trains," *Animal Behavior* 2007, dio-10, 1016/j.anbehav.2007.10.004].

Another report on this research noted:

"The feather train on male peacocks is among the most striking and beautiful physical attributes in nature, but it fails to excite, much less interest, females, according to new research. The determination throws a wrench in the long-held belief that male peacock feathers evolved in response to female mate choice. It could also indicate that certain other elaborate features in galliformes, a group that includes turkeys, chickens, grouse, quails and pheasants, as well as peacocks, are not necessarily linked to fitness and mating success" [Viegas, J., "Female Peacocks Not Impressed by Male Feathers," *Discovery News*, March 26, 2008; discovery.com/news/2008/03/26/peacock-feathers-females.html]

It's not as if the researchers set out to contradict the Darwinian principle. To the contrary, they expected to confirm it.

Hume's Philosophy

It is often stated that the watchmaker argument proposed by William Paley (in his book *Natural Theology: Evidences of the Existence and Attributes of the Deity, Collected from the Appearances of Nature*) was refuted by the humanistic philosopher David Hume in *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*.

This popular evolutionary myth is punctured by the following facts:

1. Hume was wrong in his claim that the argument *fails from analogy* because a watch and a living organism such as an eye are too different to be compared directly.

In fact, the analogy is accurate because both the watch and the eye are complex systems that function as a unit and that give every evidence of having been designed and fashioned by an intelligent being. Further, living things such as the cell and the eye and the wing are much more complicated than a watch and thus provide even greater evidence of design.

In fact, modern molecular research has demonstrated that there are actual machines operating in the living cell. Biologist Michael Behe writes:

“Shortly after 1950 science advanced to the point where it could determine the shapes and properties of a few of the molecules that make up living organisms. Slowly, painstakingly, the structures of more and more biological molecules were elucidated, and the way they work inferred from countless experiments. The cumulative results show with piercing clarity that life is based on MACHINES--machines made of molecules! Molecular machines haul cargo from one place in the cell to another along ‘highways’ made of other molecules, while still others act as cables, ropes, and pulleys to hold the cell in shape. Machines turn cellular switches on and off, sometimes killing the cell or causing it to grow. Solar-powered machines capture the energy of photons and store it in chemicals. Electrical machines allow current to flow through nerves. Manufacturing machines build other molecular machines, as well as themselves. Cells swim using machines, copy themselves with machinery, ingest food with machinery. In short, highly sophisticated molecular machines control every cellular process. Thus the details of life are finely calibrated, and the machinery of life enormously complex” (*Darwin’s Black Box*, chapter 1, “Lilliputian Biology”).

One of these biological machines is the bacterial flagellum. This microscopic motor-driven propeller drives certain bacteria. Harvard biologist Howard Berg calls it “the most efficient machine in the universe.” It is composed of a propeller, drive shaft, stator, bushing, u-joint, and a hydrogen and ion powered rotary motor. It turns at thousands of revolutions per minute and can change direction in a quarter of a turn. It can propel itself at speeds up to 60 cell lengths per second, which by proportion is more than twice as fast as a cheetah.

Another example of a living machine is the motor protein that transports cargo vesicles to and from the plasma membrane. The motor proteins attach to the vesicles and literally walk them along conveyer belts called microtubials. A life-like graphical depiction of this amazing living machine has been recreated in *The Inner Life of the Cell* (by BioVisions at Harvard University).

2. Hume was wrong in his argument that design fails as an inductive generalization since this supposedly requires past experience and we don't have past experience pertaining to whether or not organisms were designed by intelligence.

Hume and his followers claim that the argument that living creatures were designed is an argument from ignorance and is therefore not acceptable. But there is no reason why we must limit inductive reasoning in this way. When it suits them, evolutionists argue that intelligence can be discerned from its evidence. For example, the SETI project (search for extraterrestrial intelligence) is based on the premise that communication from intelligent creatures in other parts of the universe can be distinguished from general unintelligent “noise” on the basis of its structure. And they expect to recognize this alleged communication even though humans have no experience of dealing with aliens and are completely ignorant of such a thing.

3. The Bible says that God can be known by the things He has made, thus proving that the design argument is correct.

“Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse” (Romans 1:19-20).

Hume’s position was a philosophical trick to disallow the irrefutable argument of intelligent design in creation. William Dembski observes:

“All of these restrictions on inferring design are, of course, very convenient for keeping designers unacceptable to naturalism at bay. Indeed, there’s no way for a transcendent designer to get a foot in the door once one accepts this human inductive framework for design reasoning” (*The Design Revolution*, p. 226).

The Coelacanth

Evolutionists believe that the fish crawled out of the water and developed into an amphibian on its way to becoming a reptile and a bird.

In the past they pointed to an extinct fish known as *rhhipidistian* as a missing link. It was thought to have used its four fleshy, lobed fins to walk on the sea-floor, which was believed to be a step toward the evolution of legs. The coelacanth, (pronounced SEE-la-kanth), a close relative of the *rhhipidistian*, was thought to have been extinct for millions of years, and it was much studied as a missing link because of abundant fossil specimens. It was used as such by Thomas Huxley, Darwin’s bulldog, and a display at the British Museum of Natural History promoted it as a missing link to countless schoolchildren. Evolutionists speculated that it

used leg-like fins to walk and that it had a large brain and lungs.

But in 1938 this “missing link” was caught by fishermen in the Indian Ocean. Since then specimens have been found in Kenya, Tanzania, Mozambique, Madagascar, and elsewhere. When the fossil became living flesh and could be examined properly, the news was bad for evolutionists. It was found that the fins are not used for any sort of walking but simply to maneuver in the water. It only has gills, no lungs. Nothing about it is “transitional.”

“Its four fins are much like those of any other fish and are no more suitable for supporting its weight on land, or of giving rise to amphibious limbs, than those of a fairground goldfish. ... In 1986 Hans Fricke of the Max Planck Institute for Animal Behavior used underwater video cameras to observe the coelacanth in its natural habitat. Unsurprisingly, the coelacanth does not stroll on the seabed with its fins, as supposed, but swims through the water just like any other fish” (Richard Milton, *Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, p. 257).

Another Darwinian missing link was quietly dropped from the textbooks.

The coelacanth is not “primitive” in any sense. It gives birth to live young after about a year’s gestation; it has a small second tail that improves its swimming ability; and it appears to have a gland that gives it the added ability to find prey by detecting electrical signals (“The Well-Designed Living Fossil,” *Creation Moments*, April 13, 2011).

The trouble for evolutionists is even worse than this, because it casts doubt on the entire fossil strata concept. The coelacanth was used as an index fossil to date rock strata. It was assumed that any strata containing fossilized coelacanth was at least 70 million years old.

“If that age is correct, billions of coelacanths would have lived and died. Some should have been fossilized in younger rock and should be displayed in museums. Their

absence implies that coelacanths have not lived for 70 million years” (Walt Brown, *In the Beginning*, p. 35).

Biomorphs

“Computer simulations of Darwinian evolution fail when they are honest and succeed only when they are not” (David Berlinski, *The Devil’s Delusion*, p. 190).

In his book *The Blind Watchmaker*, Richard Dawkins uses “biomorphs” as evidence for evolution. They are the product of a computer program he wrote that randomly generates symmetrical figures from dots and lines. Some of the figures have the vague appearance of animals, such as a bat, a spider, a fox, and a fly.

Dawkins thinks this is proof that life can be generated from non-life, that intelligence can arise from non-intelligence, but it is more like a bad joke than good science. Consider the following facts:

1. Dawkins’ “biomorphs” are the product of intelligence!

Without the computer and the computer program, which were designed by human intelligence, there would be no biomorphs. As Richard Milton observes, “Indeed, if he set out to create an experiment that simulates evolution, he has only succeeded in making one that simulates special creation, with himself in the omnipotent role” (*Shattering the Myths*, p. 169).

2. Biomorphs are not living things, so they are not evidence that life can arise from random natural processes.

Dawkins refers to biomorphs as “quasi-biological” and “exquisite creatures,” but this is nonsense. They are neither biological nor creatures.

3. Biomorphs do not represent the complexity of DNA and the living, self-replicating cell.

4. Biomorphs demonstrate the desperation of evolutionists to find any type of evidence for their “theory.”

If there were real evidence in the real world, Dawkins would not be forced to try to invent evidence from his imagination.

Just-So Stories

“There are no detailed Darwinian accounts for the evolution of any fundamental biochemical or cellular system, only a variety of wishful speculations” (James Shapiro, molecular biologist, *National Review*, Sept. 16, 1996).

One of the most frequently-used evidences for evolution is the “just-so” story that purports to explain how evolution happened but which is actually a theoretical explanation lacking evidence.

The term “just-so story” was popularized by Rudyard Kipling’s 1902 book by that title which contained fictional stories for children. Kipling says the camel got his hump as a punishment for refusing to work, the leopard’s spots were painted on him by an Ethiopian, and the kangaroo got its powerful hind legs after being chased all day by a dingo.

Kipling’s just-so stories are as scientific as the Darwinian accounts of how the amoeba became a man.

Lacking real scientific evidence for their “theory”, evolutionists have used the just-so story to great effect. Backed by impressive scientific credentials, the Darwinian just-so story has the aura of respectability.

Biologist Michael Behe observes:

“Some evolutionary biologists--like Richard Dawkins--have fertile imaginations. Given a starting point, they

almost always can spin a story to get to any biological structure you wish" (*Darwin's Black Box*).

Consider, for example, the following account of how fish supposedly evolved:

"The corals arrived and began to build reefs, and the segmented animals developed into forms that soon would leave the sea and establish a bridgehead on land. Important changes also took place among the proto-fish. The slits in the sides of their throats, which had originated as filtering mechanisms, were walled with thin blood vessels so that they also served as gills. Now the pillars of flesh between them were stiffened with bony rods and the first pair of these bones, slowly over the millennia, gradually hinged forward. Muscles developed around them so that the front ends of the rods could be moved up and down. The creatures had acquired jaws. The bony scales in the skin which covered them grew larger and sharper and became teeth. No longer were the backboned creatures of the sea lowly sifters of mud and strainers of water. Now they could bite. Flaps of skin grew out of either side of the lower part of the body, helping to guide them through the water. These eventually became fins. Now they could swim. And so, for the first time, vertebrate hunters began to propel themselves with skill and accuracy through the waters of the sea" (David Attenborough, *Life on Earth*, based on a BBC-TV series, 1979, p. 112).

Evolutionists have never given evidence from the fossil record or from living creatures or microbiology or from any other realm that would prove that such a thing happened. It is a mythical just-so story, but it impresses people because it is delivered by the professional scientist and is wrapped in the authority of a high-tech BBC television series.

Honest evolutionists admit that they don't know how the fish evolved. F. D. Ommoney says,

“How this earliest chordate stock evolved, what stages of development it went through to eventually give rise to truly fishlike creatures, we do not know” (*The Fishes*, p. 60).

Consider this just-so story about the evolution of the ear:

“How did ears get their start? Any piece of skin can detect vibrations if they come in contact with vibrating objects. This is a natural outgrowth of the sense of touch. Natural selection could easily have enhanced this faculty by gradual degrees until it was sensitive enough to pick up very slight contact vibrations. At this point it would automatically have been sensitive enough to pick up airborne vibrations of sufficient loudness and/or sufficient nearness of origin” (Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, p. 90).

According to Dawkins it is an easy thing for vibrating skin to develop into a hearing ear, but this is children’s story-telling, not science.

Here is a just-so story of how the bird evolved:

“[John] Ostrom’s initial idea was that flight must have developed gradually over time. He envisaged feathers as having initially evolved as some form of insulation for his warm-blooded dinosaurs. As generations of these feathered dinosaurs ran around on the ground, their arms became more developed in order to help them catch their prey. The arms developed further still until wing-like structures evolved which would allow the first running dinosaurs to tentatively take to the air” (Paul Chambers, *Bones of Contention*, p. 216).

A feathered dinosaur running around flapping his arms and gradually growing wings and learning to fly is a Kipling tale for sure.

Consider this example from the *Encyclopedia Britannica* of how the insect supposedly learned to fly:

“... wings arose as fixed planes extending sideways from the thorax and were used, perhaps in some large leaping insect, for gliding. Later, muscles developed, first to control inclination and then to move the wings in flapping flight” (“Evolution”).

Fixed planes just “arose,” and muscles just “developed” and presto, you have the incredible flying insect. Nothing to it. There is absolutely no scientific evidence for such a thing.

When it comes to how life evolved from non-life, evolutionists turn again to their just-so stories. Consider this from the Field Museum in Chicago:

“Around 2.5 billion years ago, some cells began engulfing other cells. These cells were able to function together, forming a new type of cell: a eukaryote.”

If challenged to produce the scientific evidence that this actually occurred, they would have to admit that this is merely how they “think” it happened or how it “must have” happened.

That there is zero evidence for these just-so stories seems not to bother most evolutionists in the least. They figure that it had to have happened something like this because their naturalistic religion rejects divine creation and teaches them, therefore, that evolution *must* be true.

Charles Darwin was king of the just-so story. For example, he imagined a bear evolving into a whale.

“I can see no difficulty in a race of bears being rendered, by natural selection, more and more aquatic in their habits, with larger and larger mouths, till a creature was produced as monstrous as a whale” (*On the Origin of Species*, first edition).

Darwin saw no difficulty in a bear becoming a whale. It was just-so, you see.

The most recent just-so stories used as icons of evolution are those pertaining to the origin of life. There are many of these, such as the RNA-first story. In replying to the

creationist challenge that evolution cannot explain the origin of life, convinced Darwinists trot out these just-so stories with great relish as evidence that evolution *can* explain this problem. But their stories are not based on proven scientific evidence. Remove the evolutionary assumptions, and there is no evidence.

If evolutionists had real evidence, they would not invent stories.

Multiverse

The multiverse “theory” (also called megaverse, the Landscape, bubble universes, and anthropic universes) purports that our universe is only one of an infinite number of universes, none of the others being observable. The “theory” proposes that the laws of nature that we find in our universe are not necessarily the same in other universes. Thus, anything is possible somewhere.

“[the Multiverse hypothesis] popularized in David Deutsch’s book *The Fabric of Reality*, postulates the simultaneous existence of many, possibly infinitely many, parallel universes in which (almost) anything which is theoretically possible will ultimately be actualized, so that there is nothing surprising in the existence of a universe like ours” (John Lennox, *God’s Undertaker*, p. 74).

Consider some important truths about the multiverse “theory”:

1. The multiverse was invented for the sole reason of avoiding the necessity of a Creator.

Barry Arrington writes:

“Several factors are combining to increase belief (of the ‘faith’ variety, not the ‘demonstrated fact’ variety) in the multiverse among materialists. ... At the biological level materialists are beginning to understand that the probability that life arose by random material processes is

so low (estimated in this article written by materialists to be $10^{-10^{18}}$) that infinite universes are required for it to have occurred, the implication being that we just happen to live in the ever-so-lucky universe where it all came together. At the cosmological level, the probability that the fine tuning of the universe necessary for the existence of life arose by sheer coincidence is so low that again **the multiverse is invoked to provide infinite ‘probabilistic resources’ to do the job**” (Barry Arrington, “Multiverse Mavens Hoisted on Own Petard,” *Uncommon Descent*, March 6, 2010).

Michael Behe says of the multiverse “theories”:

“Their only use is as an escape hatch from the supernatural” (*Darwin’s Black Box*, chapter 11).

2. There is no scientific evidence for a multiverse.

“Let us recognize these speculations for what they are. They are not physics, but in the strictest sense, metaphysics. There is no purely scientific reason to believe in an ensemble of universes” (John Polkinghorne, *One World*, 1986, p. 80).

Dr. David Berlinski, who describes himself as a secular Jew, acknowledges that there is no evidence for a multiverse.

“The Landscape has, after all, been brought into existence by assumption. It cannot be observed. It embodies an article of faith ... There are by now thousands of professional papers about the Landscape, and reading even a handful makes for the uneasy conviction that were physicists to stop writing about the place, the Landscape, like Atlantis, would stop existing--just like that. This cannot be said of the sun” (David Berlinski, *The Devil’s Delusion*, pp. 119, 128).

Hilton Ratcliffe, in *The Virtue of Heresy: Confessions of a Dissident Astronomer*, challenges the string “theory” and other dogmas associated with multiverse. Ratcliffe critiques the big bang, relativity, and many other things pertaining to

theoretical physics. In a review of this book, John Hartnett says:

“I do agree with Ratcliffe when he argues the follies of string theorists and the like, who have **long ago departed from a sound experimental basis**. Without doubt it is dangerous to proceed into unknown territory, for four decades now in the case of string theory, **without a single experimental verification**” (“Heretic Challenges the Giants,” *Journal of Creation*, 23(2) 2009).

Paul Davies explains that it would be impossible to detect a multiverse:

“Where are the other universes? The short answer is, a very long way away. It is a prediction of the inflation theory that the size of a typical bubble [containing one universe] is fantastically bigger than that of the observed universe. By fantastically, I mean ‘exponentially’ bigger. Our observed universe is likely to be deeply embedded in a region some 10 to the 10 billionth power [ten followed by a billion zeros] kilometers across! Compare this with the size of the observable universe, a mere 10 to the 23rd power kilometers across. And if by some magic we could be transported to the edge of our bubble, we wouldn’t encounter the universe next door. Instead, there would be a region where space is still inflating, doubling in size every 10 to the minus 34 seconds or faster. So even though pocket universes like ours are expanding, they won’t intersect because they are being moved apart by inflation in the gaps between them much faster than their boundaries are growing. It is thus physically impossible, even for light, to cross the widening gulf between them” (*The Goldilocks Enigma*, p. 95).

Michael Behe, Ph.D. in biology, observes:

“No experiment has been done to support the notion of bubble universes, imaginary time, or the zillion anthropic universes. Indeed, it seems that no experiment could detect them in principle. Since they or their effects cannot

be observed, then **they are metaphysical postulates**, no more accessible to experimental investigation than an admittedly supernatural being. They do science no good” (*Darwin’s Black Box*, chapter 11).

3. To mock theists who believe in God and then appeal to a wild-eyed multiverse for which there is not a speck of evidence is the height of evolutionary folly.

As David Berlinski observes,

“After all, the theologian need only appeal to a single God lording over it all and a single universe--our own. Dawkins must appeal to an infinitely many universes crammed into creation, with laws of nature wriggling indiscreetly and fundamental physical parameters changing as one travels from one corner of the cosmos to the next, the whole entire gargantuan structure scientifically unobservable and devoid of any connection to experience” (*The Devil’s Delusion*, p. 153).

Philosopher Richard Swinburne is just as emphatic about the ridiculousness of the multiverse “theory,”

“To postulate a trillion-trillion other universes, rather than one God, in order to explain the orderliness of our universe, seems the height of irrationality” (Richard Swinburne, *Is There One God*, 1995, p. 68).

Cosmologist Edward Harrison says,

“The fine-tuning of the universe provides *prima facie* evidence of deistic design. Take your choice: blind chance that requires multitudes of universes, or design that requires only one” (*Masks of the Universe*, 1985, p. 252).

4. Further, the multiverse hypothesis solves nothing.

It does not answer how or why the universe came into existence.

The Big Bang

The big bang, also called Cosmic Evolution, is considered to be the most up-to-date scientific explanation of how the universe began. We are told that “the overwhelming consensus” supports the big bang model, though there are plenty of naysayers even among evolutionists and there are competing theories within the big bang camp.

In fact, the name “big bang” was coined by astronomer Fred Hoyle in 1950 in an attempt to distinguish it from his own competing idea, known as Steady State. He proposed that matter is continually coming into existence. (In *Darwin's Black Box*, chapter 11, Michael Behe says that Hoyle rejected the big bang because it “strongly implied the supernatural and found the prospect extremely distasteful.”)

Following is a brief description of the big bang:

“Fifteen billion years ago, a Universe erupted out of nothing in a titanic explosion that we now call the big bang. Everything--all matter, energy, even space and time--came into being at that instant. Ever since, the stuff of the Universe has been expanding and cooling. In the earliest moments of the big bang, the Universe occupied a tiny volume and was unimaginably hot. It was a blistering fireball of radiation mixed with microscopic particles of matter, but eventually, the universe cooled enough for atoms to form. Gradually, these clumped together under gravity to make billions of galaxies, great islands of stars of which our own galaxy, the Milky Way, is but one” (M. Chown, “Birth of the Universe,” *Inside Science*, 1994, cited from Andrew Snelling, *Earth's Catastrophic Past*, Vol. 2, p. 654).

The big bang is based on the discovery in the 1930s by Edwin Hubble that the universe appears to be expanding. He based this on the fact that light coming from far galaxies shifts to the red portion of the spectrum. This is thought to

indicate that the galaxies are receding. David Berlinski explains the rest:

“But a universe whose galaxies are receding is one that is expanding. The inference to the big bang now follows. A universe that is expanding is a universe with a clear path into the past. If things are now far apart, they must at one point have been close together; and if things were once close together, they must at one point have been hotter than they are now, the contraction of space acting to compress its constituents like a vise, and so increase their energy. The retreat into the past ends in a state in which material particles are at no distance from one another and the temperature, density, and curvature of the universe are infinite. **Such a state is known as a singularity, and in the case of the cosmos it is known as the big bang singularity.** The cone tapering into the past must end. The lines of sight converge. The universe had a beginning” (*The Devil’s Delusion*, p. 74).

The University of California Berkeley’s web site says, “The big bang theory states that at some time in the distant past there was nothing. A process known as vacuum fluctuation created what astrophysicists call a singularity. FROM THAT SINGULARITY, WHICH WAS ABOUT THE SIZE OF A DIME, OUR UNIVERSE WAS BORN.”

The big-bang-theory.com web site says that prior to the big bang “nothing existed, not space, time, matter, or energy -- NOTHING.”

J. J. Halliwell called the big bang “the moment of creation” (“Quantum cosmology and the creation of the universe,” *Scientific American*, 1991, 265: 6).

Following is our reply to the big bang “theory”:

1. It is based on uniformitarian assumptions.

The only reason evolutionists think they can trace an expanding universe back to a “singularity,” is because they assume there was no creation by an Almighty God. Like radiometric dating methods, the big bang is premised upon

an evolutionary “uniformitarian” view of the universe that denies divine creation *a priori*.

Astrophysicist George Ellis admits that “there is a range of models that could explain the observations” (W. Wayt Gibbs, “Profile: George F. R. Ellis,” *Scientific American*, Oct. 1995, p. 55). Ellis acknowledges that evolutionists “are using philosophical criteria in choosing our models” and that “a lot of cosmology tries to hide that.”

Each aspect of the big bang “theory” is based on an unproven assumption, such as the following from Mark Cadwallader, *Creation Spelled Out*, p. 48:

(1) The observed red shifts are assumed to indicate movement away as with the Doppler Effect.

(2) The speed of light is assumed to be constant at all points in space.

(3) The speed of light is assumed to be constant through all time.

If there was a divine creation as the Bible says, these assumptions would be misguided and would lead to the wrong conclusion.

Some creationists have theorized that Einstein’s theory of general relativity, according to which time and the speed of light are not constant and can change according to certain factors, might explain the mystery that stars appear to be millions of light years away. Mark Cadwallader, a chemical engineer, writes:

“Rapidly expanding or ‘stretching’ [Isaiah 42:5; Jeremiah 10:12] all the initial mass of the universe out from the earth into a vacuum of space would, according to general relativity, cause billions of years to transpire deep in space over the first few days of time on earth because of ‘gravitational time dilation.’ The initial mass of the universe would be so unbalanced between the center of the expansion and the edge, that gravity would distort time. Accordingly, from earth’s perspective, very little time would have transpired. However, from the stars and

galaxies in outer space at the outer edge of the huge center of gravity, billions of years would have occurred. ... Stretching outward from earth into a vacuum of space leads to gravitational time dilation, with clocks at the edge of the universe running differently than those on earth” (*Creation Spelled Out*, p. 49).

Russell Humphreys’s book *Starlight and Time* deals with this.

It is an interesting concept, but the bottom line for the Bible believer is that we know the Creator of light is not subject to the laws of light as we know them. He could have made the starlight visible on earth during the creation week in whatever way that He deemed fit. We don’t have to figure everything out; we just have to believe God’s infallible Word, for “without faith it is impossible to please God” (Hebrews 11:6). This is not blind faith. It is faith in a God who cannot lie. It is faith in a Bible that has proven itself by “many infallible proofs” to be the inerrant Word of God.

John Hartnett, Ph.D. in physics from the University of Western Australia and a research fellow in the development of technology for very precise atomic clocks, says:

“Modern ideas about the origin of the universe contain lots of complicated mathematical theories and formulas. Many people are duped into thinking that because two plus two equals four, the math of the big bang must be right. But in most cases, these formulas are not provable or testable--they remain completely theoretical, and **the models they support are based on UNPROVABLE STARTING ASSUMPTIONS**. Christians, in particular, should not be worried about this” (“Exploding the Big Bang,” *The Genesis Files*, edited by Carl Wieland, p. 87).

2. The big bang makes no sense from the perspective of the known laws of physics.

Dr. David Berlinski says:

“At the singularity itself, a great many physical parameters zoom to infinity. Just what is one to make of infinite temperature? Or particles that are no distance from one another. The idea of a singularity, as the astronomer Joseph Silk observed, is ‘completely unacceptable as a physical description of the universe ... An infinitely dense universe [is] where the laws of physics, and even space and time, break down’” (Berlinski, *The Devil’s Delusion*, p. 79).

Dr. Brian Green, professor of mathematics and physics at Columbia University, says:

“But there’s always been a couple of problems with the big bang theory. First, when you squeeze the entire universe into an infinitesimally small, but stupendously dense package, at a certain point, our laws of physics simply break down. They just don’t make sense anymore” (J. Cort and J. McMaster, *The Elegant Universe: Welcome to the 11th Dimension*, 2003, cited from Carl Werner, *Evolution: The Grand Experiment*, Vol. Vol. 2, p. 4).

Dr. David Gross, recipient of the Nobel Prize in Physics in 2004 and chair of theoretical physics at the University of California, Santa Barbara, says:

“The formulas we use [in the big bang theory] start giving answers that are nonsensical. We find total disaster. Everything breaks down, and we’re stuck” (cited from Werner, *The Grand Experiment*).

3. The big bang is only an hypothesis and even many secular scientists do not believe it.

In a *Time* magazine article, Michael Lemonick and J. Madeleine Nash referred to some of the big bang doubters, including Andrei Linde, astrophysicist at Stanford, who says, “If we really trust the data, then we are in disaster, and we must do something absolutely crazy. But this hasn’t stopped the theorists from doing crazy things anyway; they’ve proposed one mind-stretching idea after another to explain

what's going on" ("Unraveling Universe," *Time*, March 6, 1995).

In a 1990 article, H. C. Arp, G. Burbidge, Fred Hoyle, J. V. Narlikar, and N. C. Wickramasinghe called current cosmology theories "a very large intellectual edifice based on very few facts" and warned about the tendency of modern science to ignore new facts "on the grounds that the data do not fit established conformity" ("The Extragalactic Universe: An Alternative View," *Nature*, 1990, 346: 812).

In 2004, thirty-three scientists in 10 countries signed a "blistering critique of the big bang" contained in a report published in the *New Scientist*. Entitled "Bucking the Big Bang," it stated, among other things, that "the big bang theory can boast of no quantitative predictions that have subsequently been validated." Later 374 other scientists, engineers, and researchers endorsed the article (Walt Brown, *In the Beginning*, p. 86). See www.cosmologystatement.org.

4. The big bang as a cause of the existing universe is irrational.

An explosion does not produce order and life and beauty.

Very few people can understand the complicated physics behind the big bang "theory" (e.g., spiral galaxies, the theory of relativity, the Friedmann equations, Doppler shifts, the expansion of the universe, the cosmic distance ladder, singularities, dark matter, black holes, redshifts, Hubble's law, nucleosynthesis, cosmic microwave background radiation, dark energy).

Yet the vast majority of people *can* understand the dynamics of an explosion, and we know that explosions don't produce order and life and beauty.

Some evolutionists have disingenuously argued that it was not an actual "explosion," but that is how it is typically described by evolutionists themselves. Paul Davies, a physicist and cosmologist, speaks of it as "fierce violence," as a "vast explosion," and as "a searing ten billion degrees" (*The*

Goldilocks Enigma, pp. x, 23, 26, 56). A high school textbook says “a fireball exploded” (Margaret Bishop, *Focus on Earth Science*, teacher’s edition, 1981, p. 470).

For an explosion to produce the U.S. Space Shuttle would be absolute child’s play in comparison to the big bang producing our universe.

Sir Fredrick Hoyle was a renowned astronomer who understood the physics behind the big bang hypothesis, but he brought the issue back to the level of “ordinary common sense.”

“An explosion merely throws matter apart, while the big bang has mysteriously produced the opposite effect, with matter clumping together in the form of galaxies” (Hoyle, *The Intelligent Universe*, 1983, p. 185).

That the universe is finely tuned for life is admitted by evolutionists, and to say that this fine tuning is the product of a dumb explosion is, in our thinking, the height of folly. Even many evolutionists who don’t believe in biblical creation still stand in such awe of the fine tuning of the universe that they know there must be a God. The following quotations could be multiplied:

Charles Townes, Ph.D. in physics from the California Institute of Technology, winner of the Nobel Prize in Physics -- “Intelligent design, as one sees it from a scientific point of view, seems to be quite real. This is a very special universe: it’s remarkable that it came out just this way. If the laws of physics weren’t just the way they are, we couldn’t be here at all. The sun couldn’t be there, the laws of gravity and nuclear laws and magnetic theory, quantum mechanics, and so on have to be just the way they are for us to be here. Some scientists argue that ‘well, there’s an enormous number of universes and each one is a little different. This one just happened to turn out right.’ Well, that’s a postulate, and it’s a pretty fantastic postulate--it assumes there really are an enormous number of universes and that the laws could be different

for each of them. The other possibility is that ours was planned, and that's why it has come out so specially" (Townes, "Explore as Much as We Can," *UCBerkeley News*, June 17, 2005).

John O'Keefe, an astronomer with NASA -- "We are, by astronomical standards, a pampered, cosseted, cherished group of creatures.. ... If the Universe had not been made with the most exacting precision we could never have come into existence. It is my view that these circumstances indicate the universe was created for man to live in" (O'Keefe, cited by F. Heeren, *Show Me God*, 1995, p. 200).

Alan Sandage, recipient of the Crawford Prize in astronomy -- "I find it quite improbable that such order came out of chaos. There has to be some organizing principle. God to me is a mystery but is the explanation for the miracle of existence, why there is something instead of nothing" (Sandage, cited by J. N. Willford, "Sizing up the Cosmos: An Astronomer's Quest," *New York Times*, March 12, 1991, p. B9).

Freeman Dyson, renowned theoretical physicist and mathematician, recipient of the Heineman Prize, the Wolf Prize, the Templeton Prize, and the Pomeranchuk Prize -- "As we look out into the universe and identify the many accidents of physics and astronomy that have worked together for our benefit, it almost seems as if the universe must in some sense have known that we are coming" (Dyson, "Energy in the Universe," *Scientific American*, 1971, p. 59).

Arthur Schawlow, Ph.D. in physics from the University of Toronto and winner of the Nobel Prize in Physics -- "It seems to me that when confronted with the marvels of life and the universe, one must ask why and not just how. The only possible answers are religious. ... I find a need for God in the universe and in my own life" (Schawlow, cited by Henry Margenau and Roy Varghese, *Cosmos, Bios, and Theos*, 1992).

Vera Kistiakowsky, physicist at MIT -- “The exquisite order displayed by our scientific understanding of the physical world calls for the divine” (Vera Kistiakowsky, cited from *Cosmos, Bios, and Theos*, 1992, p. 52).

Paul Davies, Ph.D. in physics from the University College London, recipient of the Templeton Prize, the Kelvin Medal, and the Faraday Prize -- “There is for me powerful evidence that there is something going on behind it all. ... It seems as though somebody has fine-tuned nature’s numbers to make the Universe. ... The impression of design is overwhelming” (Davies, *The Cosmic Blueprint: New Discoveries in Nature’s Creative Ability To Order the Universe*, 1988, p. 203).

Arno Penzias, Nobel Laureate in physics in 1978 -- “Astronomy leads us to a unique event, a universe which was created out of nothing, one with the very delicate balance needed to provide exactly the conditions required to permit life, and one which has an underlying (one might say 'supernatural') plan” (Arno Penzias, cited from *Cosmos, Bios, and Theos*, 1992, p. 83).

Wernher von Braun, rocket scientist and a leading personality behind the American Apollo moon mission -- “One cannot be exposed to the law and order of the universe without concluding that there must be design and purpose behind it all. ... The inconceivability of some ultimate issue (which will always lie outside scientific resolution) should not be allowed to rule out any theory that explains the interrelationship of observed data and is useful for prediction. We in NASA were often asked what the real reason was for the amazing string of successes we had with our Apollo flights to the Moon. I think the only honest answer we could give was that we tried to never overlook anything. It is in that same sense of scientific honesty that I endorse the presentation of alternative theories for the origin of the universe, life and man in the science classroom. It would be an error to overlook the possibility that the universe was planned rather than

happened by chance (http://www.creationsafaris.com/wgcs_4vonbraun.htm).

5. The big bang cannot explain the reality of the stars and planets.

The following are just a few of the problems that the big bang cannot answer:

Many observations contradict the theory of evolution. The most popular theory holds that the solar system formed from an interstellar cloud of swirling gas and dust. If the sun, planets, and moons evolved from the same material, they should have many similarities. Yet each planet is unique.

Since about 98 percent of the sun is hydrogen or helium, Earth, Mars, Venus, and Mercury should have similar composition. Instead, much less than 1 percent of these planets is hydrogen or helium.

If the solar system evolved, all planets should spin in the same direction, but Pluto and Venus rotate backwards, while Uranus is tipped on its side and rotates like a wheel.

All moons in our solar system should orbit their planets in the same sense, but at least six have backward orbits. Furthermore, Neptune, Saturn and Jupiter have moons orbiting in both directions.

Growing a planet by many small collisions will produce an almost non-spinning planet, since the impacts will be largely self-canceling. Yet all planets spin, some much more than others.

Growing a large, distant gaseous planet such as Jupiter or Saturn poses an insurmountable hurdle for evolutionists, because gases dissipate rapidly in the vacuum of outer space and even young stars similar to our sun do not have enough orbiting hydrogen or helium to form even one Jupiter.

Scientists have no answer as to why four planets have rings or why each planet is so unique.

Theories on the moon's origin are completely inadequate. The moon's elements are too dissimilar to those of earth's. And its orbital plane and circular orbit offer strong evidence that the moon was created in its present orbit (*A Question of Origins*, www.eternal-productions.org).

Many scientists admit that they simply don't know how the stars and planets formed. The following quotes are from *In the Beginning* by Walt Brown, Ph.D. in mechanical engineering from MIT:

"To sum up, I think that all suggested accounts of the origin of the Solar System are subject to serious objections. The conclusion in the present state of the subject would be that the system cannot exist" (Harold Jeffreys, *The Earth: Its Origin, History, and Physical Constitution*, Cambridge University Press, 1976, p. 387).

"Attempts to find a plausible naturalistic explanation of the origin of the Solar System began about 350 years ago but have not yet been quantitatively successful, making this one of the oldest unsolved problems in modern science" (Stephen Brush, *A History of Modern Planetary Physics*, Vol. 3, Cambridge University Press, 1996, p. 91).

"The universe we see when we look out to its furthest horizons contains a hundred billion galaxies. Each of these galaxies contains another hundred billion stars. That's 10 to the 22nd power stars all told. The silent embarrassment of modern astrophysics is that we do not know how even a single one of these stars managed to form" (Martin Harwit, Book Reviews, *Science*, Vol. 231, March 7, 1986, pp. 1201-1202).

"I do not know the origin of the moon, I'm not sure of my own or any other's models. I'd lay odds against any of the models proposed being correct" (Dr. Harold Urey, Nobel prize-winning chemist and lunar scientist, cited by

Robert Treash, "Magnetic Remanence in Lunar Rocks," *Pensee*, Vol. 2, No. 2, May 1972, p. 22).

"Talk about a major embarrassment for planetary scientist. There, blazing away in the late evening sky, are Jupiter and Saturn--the gas giants that account for 93% of the solar system's planetary mass--and no one has a satisfying explanation of how they were made" (Richard Kerr, "A Quickie Birth for Jupiters and Saturns," *Science*, Vol. 298, Nov. 29, 2002, p. 1698).

"We've tried to form Uranus and Neptune at their present locations and failed miserably" (Stuart Weidenschilling, quoted by Richard Kerr, "Shaking Up a Nursery of Giant Planets," *Science*, Vol. 286, Dec. 10, 1999, p. 2054).

6. The big bang has its own problem with light.

Jason Lisle, Ph. D. in astrophysics from the University of Colorado, observes:

"The big bang requires that the different regions of the universe started with very different temperatures, as a consequence of quantum mechanics. As the universe expands, the different regions of the universe should have very different temperatures. Yet today they all have almost exactly the same temperature. We can see the cosmic microwave background and see the temperatures. So there is a problem, because there has not been enough time according to evolutionary timescale, even allowing 20 billion years for light to travel from one region to another and thus exchange temperature to come to equilibrium. For all the regions to have the same temperature, they have to be in contact in some way. If you put an ice cube in coffee you get lukewarm coffee. There is an exchange of heat because they are in contact. Light can exchange energy, but there hasn't been enough time. **This is called the Horizon Problem, and it is an enormous problem, because not only is the temperature of the universe uniform, it is very, very uniform**" (Lisle, *Creation Astronomy*, 2006, Answers in Genesis).

Coevolution

Another icon that is used widely in textbooks and museums is the concept of “coevolution.”

The Holt, Rinehart and Winston *Modern Biology* textbook for 1999 features this as one of the evidences for evolution. There is a photo of a long-nosed fruit bat feeding on a flower with the following text:

“The change of two or more species in close association with each other is called coevolution. Predators and their prey sometimes coevolve, parasites and their hosts often coevolve, and plant-eating animals and the plants they feed on also coevolve. One example of coevolution is plants and the animals that pollinate them.

“In tropical regions, some species of bats feed on the nectar of flowers, as shown in Figure 15-10. These bats have a slender muzzle and a long tongue with a brushlike tip, which aid them in feeding. The fur on the bat’s face and neck picks up pollen, which the bat takes to the next flower. Flowers that have coevolved with these bats are light in color, enabling the bats, which are active at night, to easily locate them. The flowers also have a fruity odor that is attractive to bats” (*Modern Biology*, p. 291).

Not a hint of scientific evidence is offered for how such a complex thing could happen in evolutionary terms. How could the right flower and the right bat, both incredibly complex in their own right, possibly evolve at precisely the same time? How could all of the precise and extremely complex genetic information have evolved simultaneously in both the bat and in the flower? With no intelligent designer involved? Just blind “natural” processes such as genetic mistakes and “natural selection”?

In many cases, the pollinating partners can’t exist apart from one another. The yucca plant depends on the yucca moth for fertilization, and the moth’s larva depend on the plant for food. The snapdragon needs a bumblebee of just the

right weight to trip its opening mechanism. Hundreds of other examples of amazing symbiosis in nature could be given. (See “Harmony and Symbiosis” in the section on Icons of Creation for more examples.)

Coevolution is an evolutionary just-so story, invented out of whole cloth and based on evolutionary assumptions unsupported by even a grain of scientific evidence. The just-so story is then used to prove evolution! This is circular reasoning with a vengeance.

How do the evolutionists know that the bat and flower coevolved? It's simple. They exist, don't they? Since they exist and since evolution is assumed to be true and since the bat and flower function interdependently, then they *must* have coevolved. But this isn't science; it is religion.

Blind evolution had to “create” each one of these amazing living, propagating things and not only that, had to “create” the perfect interrelatedness between the plant and pollinating animal. How did this happen when there was no designer, when the flower was incapable of studying the insect and the insect was incapable of studying the flower, yet each is dependent upon the other for survival and each is perfectly fitted for its role in the intricate process?

Billions Of Years

The idea that the universe is billions of years old is probably the major evolutionary icon that is used to “prove” evolution and to contradict the Bible's teaching on origins.

Before Darwin published *On the Origin of Species* in 1859, doubt had been cast on the Bible's young earth teaching through Charles Lyell's uniformitarian “theory” of geology with its claim that the earth is millions of years old. As Ian Taylor comments,

“... the revolution from young earth to old earth was the snowball starting the whole avalanche that eventually

changed mankind's entire worldview" (*In the Minds of Men*, p. 284).

Lyell was as much a Bible hater as he was a geologist. His objective was to destroy the authority of the Genesis record. He hoped to use his uniformitarian "theory" to drive men "out of the Mosaic record" (*Life, Letters, and Journals of Sir Charles Lyell*, I, pp. 253, 256, 328, cited from John Whitcomb, *The World that Perished*, p. 70). Darwin and his fellow evolutionists loved Lyell's uniformitarian doctrine because it provided them with the eons of time needed to make evolution seem feasible.

"... it was the imperative need for great antiquity that deposed catastrophism, rather than any new scientific discoveries or observations; it was a new way of looking at things, not a new piece of knowledge. ... Darwinists needed time, and lots of it: uniformitarians had the geological theory that demonstrated great antiquity. ... Thus an unusual academic interdependence sprang up between the two sciences that continues to this day. A geologist wishing to date a rock stratum would ask an evolutionist's opinion on the fossils it contained. An evolutionist having difficulty dating a fossil species would turn to the geologist for help. Fossils were used to date rocks: rocks were used to date fossils" (Richard Milton, *Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, p. 28).

Radiometric dating was invented in the 20th century and is touted to provide "absolute" results. W.F. Libby received a Nobel Prize in chemistry in 1960 for his discovery of carbon-14 dating.

Radiometric dating is built on the principle that the unstable isotope of an element decays at a set rate to form a stable element. The original isotope is called a parent and the ending one is called a daughter.

An isotope is the form of an element, such as carbon and oxygen, that has a different number of neutrons. Each

chemical element consists of atoms that are made up of three parts: protons, neutrons, and electrons.

Carbon, one of the most common elements in the universe, has 6 protons, 6 neutrons and 6 electrons. But carbon-14 has eight neutrons and is therefore an isotope.

With too many neutrons, carbon-14 is unstable, so it “decays” or adjusts to become stable, turning into carbon-12 by losing its two extra neutrons. The rate of decay can be measured.

Unstable isotopes are radioactive, meaning they eject neutrons and protons. This process can be measured by a Geiger counter. The adjusting process is called “radioactive decay.”

A measurable amount of carbon-14 is in the earth’s atmosphere, and plants take it in to produce energy through photosynthesis. Animals take in carbon-14 by eating plants or other plant-eating animals. When plants and animals die, they stop taking in carbon-14 and the amount of carbon-14 begins to decrease through the process of decay, a process scientists can measure.

Carbon-14 decay can therefore be used to date things that were once composed of living plant or animal material, such as coal.

Carbon-14 has a half-life of 5,730 years, meaning that in that time half of it will convert to carbon-12. After 2,865 years half of the remainder will be converted, and after 1,432 years half of the remainder will be converted, etc. In 100,000 years, there should be no carbon-14 left.

Since most rocks don’t contain carbon, geologists use other isotopes to date rocks: uranium-238 (changes to lead-206), uranium-235 (changes to lead-207), potassium-40 (changes to argon-40), rubidium-87 (changes to strontium-87), and samarium-147 (changes to neodymium-143). These isotopes are found in igneous rocks made of the cooling of magma or lava.

Very few people are equipped to understand radiometric dating and other complicated aspects of earth dating science, but we can thank the Lord for Bible-believing scientists who have applied critical thinking to evolutionary dating schemes.

Following are some of these:

Andrew Snelling, Ph.D. geology, University of Sydney

Don DeYoung, Ph.D. physics, Iowa State University

John Doughty, Ph.D. physics, University of Arizona

Walt Brown, Ph.D. mechanical engineering, MIT

Steven Austin, Ph.D. geology, Pennsylvania State University

John Baumgardner, Ph.D. geophysics and space physics, University of California Los Angeles

Eugene Chaffin, Ph.D. theoretical nuclear physics, Oklahoma State University

Russell Humphreys, Ph.D. physics, Louisiana State University

Larry Vardiman, Ph.D. atmospheric science, Colorado State University

Jason Lisle, Ph.D. astrophysics, University of Colorado

Danny Faulkner, Ph.D. astronomy, Indiana University

John Hartnett, Ph.D. physics, University of Western Australia

John D. Morris, Ph.D. geological engineering, University of Oklahoma

We are thankful for organizations such as Answers In Genesis and the Institute for Creation Research for keeping abreast of scientific research and theories and providing well-researched critiques.

The following facts provide an important background for interpreting evolutionary dating systems:

1. Every evolutionary dating method is built upon evolutionary assumptions.

The evidence for evolution is always dependent on evolutionary assumptions.

Dr. Andrew Snelling lists three assumptions that are made:

“Assumption 1: The original number of unstable atoms can be known. Scientists assume how many unstable (parent) atoms existed at the beginning based on how many parent and daughter atoms are left today.

“Assumption 2: The rate of change was constant. Scientists assume that radioactive atoms have changed at the same rate throughout time, ignoring the impact of Creation or changes during Noah’s Flood.

“Assumption 3: The daughter atoms were all produced by radioactive decay. Scientists assume that no outside forces, such as flowing groundwater, contaminated the sample” (Snelling, “Radiometric Dating: Back to Basics,” Answeringgenesis.org, June 17, 2009).

The Burning Candle

Remove the assumptions, and the “evidence” vanishes. The following example is excerpted from *The World That Perished* by John Whitcomb:

“Many scientists claim to have nearly infallible methods for determining the age of the earth and its various formations. But all of these methods are built upon two basic and unprovable assumptions: (1) the assumption of starting point or original condition and (2) the assumption of a uniform rate of change from that starting point to the present. Consider a burning candle in an abandoned house. It is now burning at the rate of one inch an hour. Question: How long has it been burning and, thus, how long ago was the house abandoned? Answer: No one can know until it can be shown how high the candle was when it was last lit and how fast it was burning originally! Question: How old is the earth? Answer: No one can know unless it can be shown what it

was like when it began and how rapidly it has changed since then!”

The Hourglass

The following illustration is from *The New Answers Book* by Ken Ham:

“Radioisotope dating can be better understood using an illustration with an hourglass. If we walk into a room and observe an hourglass with sand at the top and sand at the bottom, we could calculate how long the hourglass has been running. By estimating how fast the sand is falling and measuring the amount of sand at the bottom, we could calculate how much time has elapsed since the hourglass was turned over. All our calculations could be correct (observational science), but the result could be wrong. This is because we failed to take into account some critical assumptions.

“1. Was there any sand at the bottom when the hourglass was first turned over (initial conditions)?

“2. Has any sand been added or taken out of the hourglass?

“3. Has the sand always been falling at a constant rate?

“Since we did not observe the initial conditions when the hourglass time started, we must make assumptions. All three of these assumptions can affect our time calculations. If scientists fail to consider each of these three critical assumptions, then radioisotope dating can give incorrect ages” (*The New Answers Book*, 2006, p. 117).

The evolutionist assumes that he knows the conditions that existed at the formation of rocks he is testing. He assumes a uniformitarian process since then and other things. But without absolute knowledge of these things it is impossible to ascertain whether the dating results are accurate.

There is evidence, in fact, that the decay rates themselves are not stable. See, for example, Brian Thomas, “Radioactive

Decay Rates Not Stable,” Institute for Creation Research, Aug. 5, 2009.

2. Evolutionary dating has been refuted by carbon-14 testing.

The carbon-14 dating system actually disproves evolution’s millions of years doctrine.

The RATE Project

The RATE project (Radioisotopes and the Age of The Earth) was conducted by a team of eight Ph.D. scientists between 1997 and 2005.

“The objective was to gather data commonly ignored or censored by evolutionary standards of dating. The scientists reviewed the assumptions and procedures used in estimating the ages of rocks and fossils. The results of the carbon-14 dating demonstrated serious problems for long geologic ages. Samples were taken from ten different coal layers that, according to evolutionists, represent different time periods in the geologic column (Cenozoic, Mesozoic, and Paleozoic). ... The coal samples, which dated millions to \geq /hundreds of millions of years old based on standard evolution time estimates, all contained measurable amounts of ^{14}C [carbon-14]. In all cases, careful precautions were taken to eliminate any possibility of contamination from other sources. Samples in all three ‘time periods’ displayed significant amounts of ^{14}C . This is a significant discovery. Since the half-life of ^{14}C is relatively short (5,730 years), there should be no detectable ^{14}C left after about 100,000 years. The average ^{14}C estimated age for all the layers from these three time periods was approximately 50,000 years. However, using a more realistic pre-Flood $^{14}\text{C}/^{12}\text{C}$ ratio reduces that age to about 5,000 years” (*The New Answers Book 1*, pp. 85, 86).

The details of the RATE research were published in two volumes entitled *Radioisotopes and the Age of the Earth: A Young-Earth Creationist Research Initiative*.

The finding of carbon-14 in fossil bones, coal, etc. proves that these are thousands of years old rather than millions. Two scientists make this point as follows:

“The best laboratories in the world, using the best equipment under the cleanest conditions over the last three decades, have been routinely finding measurable radiocarbon in coal, oil, natural gas, limestone, fossil bones, fossil shells, and even diamonds! If these were all millions of years old, then there should be no radiocarbon left in them. The fact is that all these materials yield radiocarbon dates of only thousands of years. And all of this is documented in scientific literature, such as in the journal *Radiocarbon*. So there is a great amount of evidence that the Bible is right after all about the earth’s age” (Dr. Andrew Snelling, “Radiometric Dating and Proof,” AnswersinGenesis.org, Dec. 30, 2011).

“In recent years, readily detectable amounts of carbon-14 have been the rule rather than the exception. This is true for samples from throughout the fossil-bearing parts of the geologic record with presumed ages extending to hundreds of millions of years. The unexpected carbon-14 was initially assumed to be a result of contamination, most likely from the experimental counting procedures, but as this problem was aggressively explored, it was realized that most of the carbon-14 was inherent to the samples being measured” (Dr. Don DeYoung, Ph.D. physics, *Thousands ... Not Billions*, pp. 48, 49).

3. Evolutionary dating methods give widely differing results.

This is known as **THE ANOMALY FACTOR**. Scientists have tried to eliminate this, but they have been unsuccessful.

Rock paintings in the South African bush in 1991 were dated by Oxford University’s radiocarbon accelerator as being 1,200 years old, which was significant because it would have been the oldest bushman paintings found in the open country. It turned out that they were painted by Joan Ahrens’ art class in Capetown a few years earlier and deposited in the

bush by thieves. After describing this humorous episode, Richard Milton comments, "The significance of incidents such as this is that mistakes can only be discovered in those rare cases where chance grants us some external method of checking the dating technique. Where no such external verification exists, we have simply to accept the verdict of carbon dating" (*Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, p. 34).

Volcanic rocks in Hawaii were dated by potassium-argon at 160 million to 3 billion years old, when they were actually formed in an eruption in 1801 (Milton, *Shattering the Myths*, p. 47)

Rocks formed between 1949 and 1975 by the Mount Ngauruhoe volcano in New Zealand were dated at between 270,000 and 3.5 million years old (Dr. Andrew Snelling, "The Cause of Anomalous Potassium-Argon 'Ages' for Recent Andesite Flows at Mt. Ngauruhoe," *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Creationism*, edited by E. Walsh, 1998, pp. 503-525). Not only were the rocks only about 50 years old, but notice the vast variance of more than 3 million years between radiometric dates.

Louis Leakey's *Zinjanthropus* skull was dated to 1.75 million years by the University of California using the potassium-argon method and to 10,100 years using carbon-14 (Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, pp. 240, 241).

A rock from Mount St. Helens' 1986 volcanic eruption was dated at 350,000 years by the potassium-argon method (S. A. Austin, "Excess Argon within Mineral Concentrates from the New Dacite Lava Dome at Mount St. Helens Volcano," *Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal*, Vol. 10, No. 3, 1986).

A layer of volcanic ash at Lake Turkana, Kenya, was dated by three different radiometric dating teams (Milton, *Shattering the Myths*, pp. 53-55). A Cambridge team obtained dates ranging from 0.5 to 17.5 million years. A team at Berkeley obtained dates ranging from 1.5 to 6.9 million years. A team of the Australian National University got a date of 1.88 million years. The latter was accepted as a compromise,

but this is not science; it is guessing! With such wildly differing results, the scientists should simply admit that their dating methods don't work and that they don't have the foggiest idea how to date rocks accurately.

Dr. Steve Austin, a member of the RATE group, had samples tested from the alleged oldest and youngest strata of the Grand Canyon. He used the isochron dating method, which is supposed to be infallible. The oldest rocks were dated at 1.07 billion years while the youngest were dated at 1.34 billion (*The New Answers Book*, p. 119). Thus, the infallible isochron dating method tells us that the alleged *youngest* strata is 270 million years older than the *oldest* strata!

In another RATE study, rocks from various sites at the Grand Canyon were dated by four radioisotope methods using commercial laboratories. One set of rocks gave dates ranging from 841 million to 1.3 billion years (*The New Answers Book*, p. 121). The dates of rocks from the Beartooth Mountains of northwest Wyoming ranged from 1.5 billion to 2.6 billion years. That only a mere 1.1 billion years of difference!

Dating methods that are this wildly variable and contradictory surely lack any element of real scientific authority.

4. Evolutionists are highly selective in choosing dates.

Typically they select dates they prefer while ignoring those they find unacceptable. Dating methods that return a young age for the earth are ignored. Again, this is not science; it is myth making.

“Science has proposed many methods of geochronometry ... but of these many methods, only one technique--that of the radioactive decay of uranium and similar elements--yields an age for the Earth of billions of years. And it is this one method that has been enthusiastically promoted by Darwinists and

uniformitarian geologists, while all other methods have been neglected” (Richard Milton, *Shattering the Myths*, p. 38).

“The chief tool employed to harmonize discordant dates is the simple device of labeling unexpected ages as anomalous and, in the future, discarding those rock samples that will lead to the ‘anomalous’ dates. This practice is the explanation of why many dating results seem to support each other--because **all samples that give ages other than expected values are rejected as being ‘unsuitable’ for dating.** ... **If all the rejected dates were retrieved from the waste basket and added to the published dates, the combined results would show that the dates produced are the scatter that one would expect by chance alone**” (Milton, *Shattering the Myths*, pp. 49, 51).

This is admitted by Dr. Richard L. Mauger, associate professor of geology at East Carolina University:

“In general, dates in the ‘correct ball park’ are assumed to be correct and are published, but **those in disagreement with other data are seldom published** nor are discrepancies fully explained” (“K-Ar Ages of Biotites from Tuffs in Eocene Rocks,” *Contributions to Geology*, Vol. 15, no. 1, 1977, p. 37).

Professional pressures motivate scientists to conform to expected dating results:

“... there are powerful professional pressures on scientists to conform to a consensus. Dating geologists are offended by the suggestion that their beliefs can or would influence the dates obtained. Yet nothing could be easier or more natural. Take for example a rock sample from the late Cretaceous, a period which is universally believed to date from some 65 million years ago. **Any dating scientist who obtained a date from the same of, say, 10 million years or 150 million years, would not publish such a result because he or she will, quite sincerely, assume it**

was in error. On the other hand, any dating scientist who did obtain a date of 65 million years would hasten to publish it as widely as possible. **Thus the published dating figures always conform to preconceived dates and never contradict those dates**" (Milton, *Shattering the Myths*, p. 51).

"It may come as a shock to some, but **fewer than 50 percent of the radiocarbon dates from geological and archaeological samples in northeastern North America have been adopted as *acceptable* by investigators**" (J. Ogden, director of a radiocarbon laboratory, *Annals of the New York Academy of Science*, 1977, 288:167).

Ian Taylor, an engineer, observes,

"None of this is ever mentioned in popular magazines and textbooks, and the impression is left in the reader's mind that 'absolute' chronology has been established by the radiocarbon method" (*In the Minds of Men*, pp. 317, 318).

5. Most dating methods point to a young earth.

Walt Brown, Ph.D. in mechanical engineering from MIT, lists 22 dating methods that point to a young earth. See *In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood*, pp. 37-41.

Andrew Snelling, Ph.D. in geology, lists several dating methods that point to a young earth. See *Earth's Catastrophic Past*, Volume 2.

Following are some questions that evolutionists need to answer. These are by Mark Cadwallader, a chemical engineer working in product development and material failure investigations (*Creation Spelled Out*):

Why do the earliest civilizations and written history date back less than 10,000 years?

Why do the oldest trees happen to be just a few thousand years old?

Why is there so little helium in the atmosphere if such a quickly diffusing gas is escaping into the atmosphere from rocks at high rates?

Why are there radioactive halos preserved in granite rocks from elements with half-lives of only several minutes? The halos are like preserved bubbles which should have passed on out through molten rock that supposedly took millions of years to cool.

Why do polystrate fossils pierce through so many different layers of supposed “geologic time”?

Why are carbon-14 dating measurements continually finding mere thousands of years for fossilized trees, and why is C14 being found in some diamonds and coal in which all the radioactive carbon with a relatively short half-life should be long gone because they are supposedly millions of years old?

Why are many gas and oil reservoirs under such high pressures, so that they become “gushers” and flow of their own accord, when rock porosity, permeability, and cracks are all around to relieve pressure over the supposed millions of years that the fossil fuels have been there?

Why is the earth’s magnetic field decaying so rapidly, extrapolating backwards to levels that would be destabilizing within approximately 10,000 years?

Why do we see so many comets in our solar system, since the comet tails are evidence of their volatile material boiling away as they pass by the sun? They should all have been consumed and invisible by now if the solar system is billions of years old.

Why haven’t the continents eroded nearly flat?

Why haven’t the oceans accumulated sediment thousands of feet deep if the earth is really billions of years old?

Why aren’t the oceans much saltier at the rate they accumulate salt, at least like the Great Salt Lake and the Dead Sea, if they are so old?

Dr. David Stone offers the following challenge to students:

“The observations cited in the questions above are all affirmative evidence for a young earth. Evolutionists will always come up with stories to try to explain away the simple, direct implication of these observations. It’s up to you to discern between stories and evidence.”

6. Biomaterials found in fossils point to a young earth.

What explains the existence of biomaterials and soft tissue in fossils that are allegedly millions of years old?

“Researchers have uncovered biological molecules like proteins, DNA, and pigments from rocks that are supposedly millions of years old. Laboratory studies on many of these materials indicate that they will only survive thousands, not millions, of years. DNA is particularly prone to decay, yet ancient fossil ‘plants, bacteria, mammals, Neanderthals, and other archaic humans have had short aDNA sequences identified.’ ...

“Bones are often fossilized through mineral replacement. However, *soft* bone and other original biomaterials are continually being discovered. For example, some ‘fossil’ material is actual collagen protein from the original animal. Since laboratory studies have consistently shown that even well-preserved collagen should turn to dust in 30,000 years, these fossils must be much younger than conventional dating indicates.

“One mummified (not fossilized) hadrosaur that was examined in a Discovery Channel special in September 2008 is not made of scattered collagen fibers, but whole tissues--in fact, its whole body--are still intact! Dubbed ‘Leonardo,’ its skin pattern and stomach contents are discernible, making it ‘unquestionably one of the most unexpected and important dinosaur discoveries of all time.’ But its startling preservation was only ‘unexpected’ by those who believe that Leonardo is 77 million years old” (Brian Thomas, “Fossilized Biomaterials Must Be Young,” *Acts & Facts*, 38 (6): 17, 2009, Institute for Creation Research).

In 2011 PLoS ONE reported on a “34-million-year” old cuttlefish fossil with organic chitin remaining in the cuttlebone (“Fossil Cuttlefish Has Original Tissue,” ICR, Dec. 14, 2011)..

Other researchers found chitin in a scorpion that is supposedly hundreds of millions of years old (“Evolution Can’t Explain Organic Fossils,” ICR, Dec. 15, 2011).

A mosasaur fossil (a 40-foot-long marine reptile) at the Dinosaur Institute of the National History Museum of Los Angeles County, supposedly millions of years old, has retina pigment, dried blood residue, and “preservation of skin structures from all parts of the body” (J. Londgren, “Convergent Evolution in Aquatic Tetrapods: Insights from an Exceptional Fossil Mosasaur,” PLoS ONE, 5 (8): e1198, 2010, cited from Brian Thomas, “Extraordinary Mosasaur Fossil Reveals Soft Tissues,” *Acts & Facts*, 39 (11): 19, 2010).

In 2005, Mary Schweitzer and her colleagues published a paper in *Science* magazine describing the presence of soft tissue in the fossilized femur of a *Tyrannosaurus rex* unearthed in Montana.

“Schweitzer et al. reported the presence of structures that appeared to be blood vessels and blood cells with nuclei where DNA could be found. Many of the tissues could be stretched repeatedly and returned to their original shape indicating the presence of elastic proteins commonly found in blood vessels. Pictures of the tissue and experiments comparing the T. rex tissue with ostrich bone tissue appeared to confirm that the material was soft tissue. The presence of soft tissue, which decomposes rapidly after an organism dies, fits the Creation model (asserting that dinosaurs lived recently, in the last 10,000 years) better than an evolutionary scenario making dinosaurs older than 65 million years” (Daniel Criswell, “How Soon Will Jurassic Park Open?” *Impact* # 396, June 2006).

In 2009, researchers reconstituted dried ink from a “150 million-year-old” fossil squid’s ink sac. They even used the ink to draw a picture of what the extinct squid looked like. Scientists were “stunned” that it “still looks as if it is modern squid ink” (“The 150 million-year-old squid fossil,” *Archaeology Daily News*, Aug. 18, 2009, archaeologydaily.com).

2009 was also the year of the discovery of *Darwinius masillae*, an alleged 47-million-year-old “missing link” with preserved fur and soft tissue (“100 Years - 100 Objects,” Houston Museum of Natural Science, Dec. 30, 2009).

In 2013 it was reported that the remains of an ancient camel was found in Canada’s high Arctic. The Canadian Museum of Nature in Ottawa claims that it is 3.5 million years old, but the remains are mummified, not fossilized, and tiny fragments of collagen are preserved (“Ancient Arctic camel a curious conundrum,” *Fox News*, March 5, 2013).

Also in 2013 researchers published the finding of an alleged 46-million-year-old mosquito full of blood. The mosquito’s stomach contains iron bound in a heme molecule that is used to transport oxygen (“Scientists Have Found an Ancient Fossilized Mosquito Full of Blood,” *Business Insider*, Oct. 14, 2013).

In 2015, scientists in Colombia announced the discovery of a fossil of a marine reptile with preserved soft tissue. They have given it the name “*Eonatator coellensis*.” The fossil is supposed to be 80 million years old. The soft tissue is in the area of the lungs, the pancreas, and muscle fibers extending to the ribs (“Nearly complete fossil of Cretaceous reptile,” *Fox News*, Feb. 18, 2015). The remains of the sea creature were found several hundred miles from the sea.

In 2008, *BBC News* reported on fossil feathers that have retained their pigment colors (“Fossil Feathers Reveal Their Hues,” July 8, 2008). The colors are created by biological melanosomes that have been preserved. The scientists who are studying the feathers have admitted they don’t know how

it is possible that such biomaterial is present in fossils that are supposed to be millions of years old. Professor Mike Benton of the University of Bristol asks, “How do you square that with **the well-known fact that the majority of organic molecules decay in thousands of years?**”

The only answer they have is that since they KNOW that the fossils are millions of years old, it must therefore be possible for biomaterial to last millions of years!

This isn't science; it's circular reasoning.

This reminds me of a joke I heard about a man who thought he was dead and was being interviewed by a psychiatrist. The doctor, who was trying to talk some sense into him, said, “So you think you are dead?” And the man replied, “Yes, I'm dead.” The doctor asked, “Do dead men bleed?” When the man replied, “No, dead men don't bleed,” the doctor reached over and pricked him with a pin so that he started bleeding. “What do you think now?” the doctor asked. The persistent man exclaimed, “I guess dead men do bleed!”

Following are some helpful resources on the subject of evolutionary dating methods:

Earth's Catastrophic Past: Geology, Creation and the Flood by Dr. Andrew A. Snelling (Volume 2)

In the Minds of Men: Darwin and the New World Order by Ian T. Taylor

Radioisotopes and the Age of the Earth: A Young-Earth Creationist Research Initiative

Thousands Not Billions by Dr. Don DeYoung

Taking Back Astronomy by Dr. Jason Lisle

Universe by Design by Dr. Danny Faulkner

The Young Earth: The Real History of the Earth by Dr. John Morris

Icons Of Creation

Evolutionists say, “Where is the evidence for creation?” We reply, “Everywhere!”

Everywhere we look in nature, using our natural eyes or the most powerful microscopes or telescopes, we find evidence of a Divine Designer.

Sir Isaac Newton once said, “In the absence of any other proof, the thumb alone would convince me of God’s existence.”

Biologist Michael Behe, though he is not a biblical creationist, calls “intelligent design” *the elephant in the room* for evolutionists:

“Imagine a room in which a body lies crushed, flat as a pancake. A dozen detectives crawl around, examining the floor with magnifying glasses for any clue to the identity of the perpetrator. In the middle of the room, next to the body, stands a large, gray elephant. The detectives carefully avoid bumping into the pachyderm’s legs as they crawl, and never even glance at it. Over time the detectives get frustrated with their lack of progress but resolutely press on, looking even more closely at the floor. ... There is an elephant in the roomful of scientists who are trying to explain the development of life. The elephant is labeled ‘intelligent design.’ To a person who does not feel obliged to restrict his search to unintelligent causes, the straightforward conclusion is that many biochemical systems were designed. They were designed not by the laws of nature, not by chance and necessity; rather, they were planned” (*Darwin’s Black Box*, chapter 9, “Intelligent Design”).

The “design” argument, in fact, is Scriptural, because the Bible says that the creation is evidence for the existence of an Almighty God.

“For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse. Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened” (Romans 1:18-21).

This passage says that the invisible things of God are seen in creation and that this is an evidence that God has given to men. The part of God’s character that is witnessed by creation is His “eternal power and Godhead.” Men are therefore without excuse if they do not believe in God and do not seek God. Verse 21 says that the reason men do not glorify God is that their hearts are darkened by sin.

This is why men cannot “clearly see” God through creation.

“In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them” (2 Corinthians 4:4).

The design argument from nature can be a powerful tool in evangelism. Consider the case of Dr. Jobe Martin:

“In the fall of 1971 I went to Baylor University in Dallas and gave my first lecture. It was on the evolution of the tooth. I talked about how these fish scales gradually migrated into the mouth and became teeth. A couple of students came to me after the class that day and said, ‘Dr. Martin, have you ever investigated the claims of creation science?’ I had never even heard of it. So I said, ‘Sure, I’ll look into this with you.’ And I’m thinking, kind of as a cocky young professor, ‘I’ll blow these guys away.’

“Well, they asked me to study the assumptions that the evolutionists make. In all of my eight years of scientific education, I had never had a single professor tell me about an assumption. So we started looking at the assumptions. I began to realize that evolutionists are making some claims that are based on assumptions that aren't valid, when they tell us that rocks are so old and these kinds of things.

“Then they asked me to start studying some animals and see if I thought that animal could have evolved. The first thing that we studied together was this little bug called the bombardier beetle. This little insect, which is about a half inch long, mixes chemicals that explode. I began to think, O.K. how would that evolve? If evolution is true it had to somehow evolve that. Let's assume it is evolving this defense mechanism, but the first time that it finally produces the explosion, what happens to the bug? Well, it is destroyed by the explosion, and we know that splattered bug pieces don't evolve. So I thought, how could this have happened? Well, [because of the intricate way it is built] it doesn't blow itself up. It has another little factory inside itself and it manufactures a chemical that acts as a catalyst, so when it squirts that chemical into these other chemicals that are in a suspended state it produces the explosion. And it has an asbestos-lined firing chamber to protect itself. And it has two little twin tail tubes, and it can aim these tubes out the side, even out the front. Let's say a spider is coming up toward its side and it doesn't have time to turn around and shoot. It can just take its little gun turret, aim it out to the side, and shoot. If you are listening to the explosion all you hear is a single pop, but scientists have now put that sound into slow motion, and it is like about a thousand sequential little explosions that are so fast that all we hear is one pop. So you think, why would that be? It was a curious thing for the scientists that are studying this little bug. A lot of them are at Cornell University and some other places. What they discovered was that if it were just one big explosion, the little bug would be jetted away by the force!

But as long as it is a sequential explosion, the bug with his little legs can hang on. How would evolution explain a sequential explosion?

“This little bug messes with all of the theories of evolution. There is no way a slow, gradual process is going to produce this bug. There is no way, even, that the newer theories, such as punctuated equilibrium, can explain this bug. I began to realize that this little bug needed to have all of its parts there at once or you just don’t have the animal.

“And my stomach started to churn. My wife will tell you that my stomach churned for five years. It took a five-year struggle for me to begin to flip the way I think, from thinking in an evolutionary way to thinking that this creature was created fully formed just like it is. That went against everything I had ever learned” (Jobe Martin, *Incredible Creatures that Defy Evolution 1*, ExplorationFilms.com).

Apologists for evolution claim that the “design” argument has been refuted. They cite philosophers such as David Hume who supposedly overthrew the “watchmaker argument,” which was published in William Paley’s book *Natural Theology, or Evidences of the Existence and Attributes of the Deity Collected from the Appearances of Nature* (1802). Paley’s simple common-sense argument says that if you find a watch lying on the ground you would recognize immediately that it was designed and produced by an intelligence; likewise, the creation demonstrates evidence of intelligent design. Contrary to the claims of some, Paley’s argument has never been refuted and indeed cannot be refuted. Dr. Michael Behe says:

“But exactly where, we may ask, was Paley refuted? Who has answered his argument? How was the watch produced without an intelligent designer? It is surprising but true that the main argument of the discredited Paley has actually never been refuted. Neither Darwin nor

Dawkins, neither science nor philosophy, has explained how an irreducibly complex system such as a watch might be produced without a designer. Instead Paley's argument has been sidetracked by attacks on its injudicious examples and off-the-point theological discussions. Paley, of course, is to blame for not framing his argument more tightly. But many of Paley's detractors are also to blame for refusing to engage his main point, playing dumb in order to reach a more palatable conclusion. ... Paley's argument over the years has been turned into a straw man to knock down. Instead of dealing with the real complexity of a system (such as a retina or a watch), some defenders of Darwinism are satisfied with offering a story to account for peripheral features" (*Darwin's Black Box*, chapter 10).

The design argument has grown even stronger since Paley's day through research into microbiology and the discovery of the amazing living machinery in the cell.

The obvious design in creation has convinced multitudes of people, including scientists, that there is a God.

In 1962, Nobel laureate molecular biologist E.C. Komfield said:

"While laboring among the intricacies and definitely minute particles in a laboratory, I frequently have been overwhelmed by a sense of the infinite wisdom of God ... the simplest man-made mechanism requires a planner and a maker; how a mechanism ten times more involved and intricate can be conceived as self-constructed and self-developed is completely beyond me" ("The Evidence of God in an Expanding Universe," *Look*, Jan. 16, 1962).

Michael Denton, Australian molecular geneticist, echoes this sentiment:

"It is the sheer universality of perfection, the fact that everywhere we look, to whatever depth we look, we find an elegance and ingenuity of an absolutely transcendent quality, which so mitigates against the idea of chance. Is it

really credible that random processes could have constructed a reality, the smallest element of which--a functional protein or gene--is complex beyond our own creative capacities, a reality which is the very antithesis of chance, which excel in every sense anything produced by the intelligence of man? Alongside the level of ingenuity and complexity exhibited by the molecular machinery of life, even our most advanced artifacts appear clumsy” (Denton, *Evolution--A Theory in Crisis*, 1985, p. 342).

Consider some of the Icons of Creation that point to an Almighty God.

(The first two of the icons, the Monarch Butterfly and the Trilobite, are subjects of professional PowerPoint/Keynote presentations in the apologetics course *An Unshakeable Faith*, which is available from Way of Life Literature.)

The Monarch Butterfly

Digital SLR photography is both a hobby and a ministry tool for me, and I enjoy the challenge of photographing butterflies and dragonflies. The monarch butterfly lives up to its name in that it is the king of these amazing creatures and a wonderful icon of divine creation. I own many books on butterflies and have visited prominent butterfly conservatories in several countries, and in my experience evolutionists don't even try to explain how such a creature could have evolved. They merely presume that it did. They even talk about the “co-evolution” of the butterfly and the flower, as if natural selection and mutation or any other naturalistic concept could possibly explain the origin of such wonderful symbiotic relationships! How could blind evolution create such a thing? If the flower and the pollinating insect did evolve, they had to have evolved at exactly the same time--like in the same day or week--because they are dependent on one another for their very existence.

Metamorphosis

The monarch butterfly's Latin name, *Danaus plexippus*, means "sleepy transformation," referring to its amazing life cycle.

The butterfly goes through a four-stage process called *metamorphosis*: from egg, to larva, to pupa, to adult.

It begins life as a tiny, brilliantly-designed **EGG** that the female butterfly attaches to the exact type of vegetation needed by the caterpillar when it hatches. It is attached with a special glue that hardens rapidly and holds the egg securely in all types of weather. The egg stage usually lasts a few days, but eggs laid before winter can enter a resting stage and hatch the following spring.

Within this tiny egg is an entire world of genetic information. It contains the instructions for the construction of the caterpillar and to create the intelligence it needs to operate all of its organs (eyes, antennae, legs, etc.), to maneuver within its environment, to digest leaves, to avoid predators, to know when and how to molt, to pupate, etc. It contains the instructions for the incredibly complex process of the final molting and formation of the pupa, including the amazing cremaster mechanism. It contains the instructions for the death and dissolution of the caterpillar into a biological soup and the reformation of that soup into a beautiful butterfly. It contains the instructions not only to construct the butterfly in all of its mind-boggling complexity (e.g., its proboscis, its compound eyes, its intricately shingled wings, its sensory organs, its reproductive organs) but also to create the butterfly's brain and the intelligence needed to thrive within its environment, to fly, to land, to avoid predators, to find the right plants and flowers, to drink and digest nectar, to keep its cold-blooded metabolism in balance, to reproduce. It contains the instructions for a bewildering multi-thousand mile migration to a place it has never been and in the absence of any earthly guide. It would seem, in fact, that the genetic code within that tiny monarch butterfly

egg contains a map of a large part of the earth! And it contains the information for constructing hundreds of copies of itself.

The creature emerges from the egg as a larva or **CATERPILLAR**. It is an eating machine that increases its weight 3,000 times in 20 days, doubling in size about every 12 hours. This would be like a human baby increasing from eight pounds to 24,000 pounds in less than two weeks! The monarch caterpillar eats only milkweed, which is poisonous to other insects. It “sequesters” this substance and retains it through the metamorphosis process into the butterfly stage, thus providing protection for the flying insect.

The caterpillar has three pairs of “true legs” and up to six pairs of “prolegs.” The prolegs have rings of tiny hooks called crochets that help them grip the leaves and stems of plants. The creature’s brain and nervous system control the extremely complex coordinated movement of its legs. Some caterpillars can produce smelly chemicals that it uses for defense. The caterpillar weaves a mat of silk threads on the leaves on which it walks. “The silk is produced by a spinneret situated behind the mouth-parts, so the caterpillar has to move its head from side to side in order to weave the silk mat. ... This silk helps the caterpillar to hold on to the leaf. There is some evidence that the silk threads may also serve as a chemical trail to help the caterpillar trace back its path if it has a particular hideout” (*Butterflies of Peninsular India*).

As the caterpillar grows, it casts off its outer skin layer four or five times. This is called molting, and it is necessary to accommodate its rapidly increasing size.

“There are sensors in the skin of the caterpillar that are strain detectors, that detect the amount of pressure or strain being put on the skin and when that is too great they send a signal to the brain which then releases a hormone that causes molting” (Paul Nelson, Biola University, *Metamorphosis*, DVD, Illustra Media, 2011).

When the caterpillar molts, it sheds its entire head capsule, with its six eye lenses and spinneret. Thus, during the molting stage, “there must be four or five different head capsules made, each one being bigger to accommodate the growing caterpillar” (Jules Poirier, *From Darkness to Light to Flight*, p. 6).

Toward the end of the caterpillar stage, “imaginal cell clusters” appear at various locations in its body, and these contain the information for the future butterfly.

When it has grown to the right size, the caterpillar locates a suitable place on a milkweed leaf. It might make long journeys of 10 to 20 yards searching for the proper location. It spins a silk pad, from which it hangs by its prolegs to form a **PUPA OR CHRYSALIS**. After a day or two, the caterpillar molts the final time but this time the post molting appearance is completely different. “There is no longer any head capsule, no jaws and no legs. The new appearance is of a relaxed and wet pupa.”

During the final molt, the caterpillar attaches itself firmly to the silk pad by means of a **CREMASTER** that has microscopic hooks. This is an absolutely essential step, since it has been hanging by its prolegs but these will be shed with the final molting.

“When the skin is pushed to the top it uncovers a hole above the abdominal area, about 0.25 inches from the end of the pad. A black, stalk-like cremaster (about 0.1 inch long) protrudes through this hole. It lunges three times forward through the hole toward the silk pad. On the outer end of this cremaster is a bulb covered with hundreds of microscopic hooks of various forms. On the third lunge the front end pierces the silk pad, after which the body of the caterpillar rotates clockwise three times, thrusting the cremaster hooks deeper into the silk pad. In this position the body of the caterpillar begins to do all kinds of convulsive gyrations to remove the old outer skin from the silk pad. ... The insertion of the cremaster into the silk pad at the precise time is very critical to the

survival of the butterfly ... [and] the insertion of the cremaster was accomplished by a totally blind caterpillar. Think of all the carefully coordinated design features of this transformation process” (Poirier, *From Darkness to Light to Flight*, pp. 10, 11).

The pupa must be attached securely to the silk pad. If the pupa falls at this point it ruptures, because it is full of liquid. The cremaster’s microscopic hooks attach something like Velcro but “the connection is so tight that if one simply pulls at the chrysalis, the chrysalis will break before the hooks pull lose from the silk pad. This protects the cremaster from being blown loose in storms” (Edith Smith, “Meandering Thoughts,” Aug. 21, 2010, Shady Oak Butterfly Farm, Brooker, Florida).

After a few hours the pupal skin hardens.

Butterfly pupae come in a wide variety of shapes and sizes. Some are cleverly camouflaged. The pupa of the tailed jay looks like a new bud, while that of the giant owl butterfly looks like a dead leaf.

During the pupa stage, the creature’s body and organs and even its very cells dissolve into a cellular liquid referred to as “SOUP.”

“Cell death is programmed. If you kill the wrong cells, you are in deep trouble. It’s very carefully engineered. You’re going to save some of the cell population so you have to know where you’re going to end up before you start” (*Metamorphosis*, DVD, Illustra Media, 2011).

This “soup” reorganizes itself into a beautiful butterfly!

Dr. David Stone observes:

“This is so far beyond the best of human technology, that words fail. Hire the brightest scientists and engineers on the planet, give them an unlimited budget, even unto trillions of dollars, and an open-ended schedule, and how likely is it that they could generate such a ‘soup’? Zero. This is yet another example that there is no theory of

evolution, or even a wild speculation, to account for such an ubiquitous little creature as a butterfly.”

When it is ready to emerge, the butterfly taps onto the front of the pupa with its legs and the pupal skin breaks and opens in front like a door. The butterfly exits and suspends itself in order to pump the veins of its wings full of fluid to unfold them. This takes about 15 minutes. It also joins the two segments of its proboscis to form one sucking tube. It knows how to do all of this, though it has never existed in this form before.

The caterpillar has 16 short legs, a chewing mouth, six simple eyes that see only in black and white, eats leaves, and crawls. The butterfly has six long articulated legs, a sucking mouth, antennae, a proboscis, four wings, reproductive organs, two complicated compound eyes that can see in color, drinks nectar, and it can fly!

The change has been likened to a Model-T Ford forming its own garage and then within that garage disassembling itself and then reassembling itself into a high-tech helicopter and flying off. Even this would not be nearly as dramatic, though, as the real change that occurs through butterfly metamorphosis.

Metamorphosis is described even by secular biologists as a “miraculous change of form.” They admit that “there is no evidence how such a remarkable plan of life ever came about” (Peter Farb, *The Insects*, Life Nature Library, p. 56).

Science journalist Richard Milton says, “To say that this process is not understood ... means that no stage or aspect of this physical process can be accounted for or even guessed at with our current knowledge of chemistry, physics, genetics, or molecular biology, extensive though they are” (*Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, p. 220).

Michael Pitman, who taught biology at Cambridge, asks how it would be possible for metamorphosis to have evolved:

“Within this dry shell the organs of the caterpillar are dissolved and reduced to pulp. Breathing tubes, muscles and nerves disappear as such; the creature seems to have died. But processes are in operation which remould that pulp into different, coordinating parts, and in due course the insect, which has not grown up or developed in any normal sense, re-emerges as a beautiful, adult butterfly. It is a kind of resurrection. Certainly it demonstrates the absurdity of invoking natural selection by successive mutation to explain such an obviously, yet subtly programmed, process. Why, on that basis, should the ancestral insect have survived the mutations that projected it into the chrysalid stage, from which it could not yet develop into an adult? Where was natural selection then? How could pre-programmed metamorphosis, in insect, amphibian or crustacean, ever have evolved by chance? Indeed, how could development have evolved piece-meal? The ball is in the evolutionist’s court, tangled in a net of inexplicability” (*Adam and Evolution*, p. 71).

Even if we assume that a caterpillar could evolve from something else, how could evolution proceed beyond that to the pupa and the butterfly? Why would a happy little “evolved” caterpillar, merrily eating its way through succulent leaves, decide to spin a silk pad and form itself into a pupa? And if somehow this came into its thinking process, how could it learn to do such an amazingly complicated thing? And why? And even if this somehow happened, and the caterpillar mysteriously dissolved into a biological soup, that would be the end of it. *How would the dissolved caterpillar ever rearrange itself into a different creature unless this entire process was already programmed in its genetic makeup? Genetic mutations and natural selection stand mute before metamorphosis.*

Furthermore, the caterpillar cannot reproduce. It has no sex organs. If it does not go through the death and rebirth of metamorphosis and become a butterfly, it has no way to

perpetuate itself. It had to have had the ability to undergo metamorphosis from the very beginning in order to exist!

The metamorphosis process had to have been perfect from the beginning. A partial metamorphosis would mean death to the creature. The process *must* form a perfect butterfly that can carry out the complicated mechanism of reproduction.

“By its very nature, metamorphosis is an all or nothing proposition. And throughout biological history, its success has hinged upon the immediate availability of a full set of instructions, including genes, proteins, and the developmental program required to integrate them. It all has to be in place ahead of time. It needs to have the genes in place, the regulatory elements that are going to turn the genes on and off; it has to have all the cells preprogrammed to do what they are going to do so they respond to the signals they get in the right way. The larval cells have to know they are going to die. ... [The process] has to happen rapidly and in a coordinated fashion. Once you’re committed to the chrysalis stage, there is no going back. You have to complete the transition. A caterpillar that is equipped to go 10 percent, 25 percent through metamorphosis is *no way* through metamorphosis. Part way in a process that requires getting out the other side as a fully formed adult doesn’t work. You have to recreate adult legs, adult antennae, adult eyes; you have to change the shape of the brain and the connections to the organs; you have to reformat the gut so that it switches from eating plant material to eating nectar. How many mutations does it take? And how do you coordinate all of that? If you get the eyes right but the gut wrong it’s a failure as a butterfly. If you get the wings right and the legs right but the muscles don’t attach, that butterfly is going nowhere. It’s dead. You begin to see the depths of the problem. So for evolution to have created this sort of pathway, gradually, it would take a miracle. Metamorphosis, if it came into existence at all by an undirected process, had to have done so in one fell swoop. Natural selection, by definition, cannot build that kind of

process. To create a process like metamorphosis, you'd need a totally different type of cause, something that could see a distant target, keep that target in focus, and provide all the resources necessary to hit the bull's eye on the first shot. The only cause that could accomplish that is an intelligent agent" (*Metamorphosis*, DVD, Illustra Media, 2011).

Biologist Richard Stringer, who has captured this transformation through magnetic resonance imaging, says:

"You have a great big orchestra in there, and you have a conductor, some conducting force, that's responsible for it all. I can say without any doubt that it was the most amazing thing I've ever seen" (*Metamorphosis*, DVD).

Migration

In September and October one variety of the monarch flies 2,500-3,000 miles from Canada and the northern USA east of the Rocky Mountains to locations it has never seen in mountain forests in central Mexico. It even flies to the very same tree where its forebears overwintered! The exact hibernation sites were not discovered until 1975 when Dr. Fredrick Urquhart of the University of Toronto developed a method of tagging and tracking the butterflies. Hundreds of millions of butterflies find their way unerringly to these remote locations each year.

The generation that flies to Mexico is called the "**Methuselah Generation**" because it is genetically programmed to live for six to eight months rather than the few weeks that is typical for monarch butterflies. This allows it to complete the first part of the massive migratory movement and is necessary for the monarch's survival. (Some of them actually make the entire migration and return to their starting place in the north.)

The migration to Mexico takes about two months, with the insect averaging about 30 miles a day, and the butterflies hibernate over winter in small concentrated areas, with

millions congregated in a few acres. Some of the butterflies actually cross the Gulf of Mexico.

In mid-March the females fly north for some distance, lay eggs, and die. The caterpillars hatch, go through metamorphosis, then continue the migration north. The new butterflies that hatch on the way, though they never meet their parents, know where they are on the migration route and exactly where to go and how to get there. It is the second, third, or even fourth generation that arrives back in the northern areas from where their forebears originated!

“There are butterflies that are programmed to fly back in two generations, and perhaps some in four or five generations, but all are programmed to go to a definite site in the Neovolcanic Mountains and to return to where their forefathers started in the north. There are more butterflies that make it back to their northern fall sites in multiple generations than in a single generation. ... Monarchs migrating in the fall are programmed to travel to specific sites on certain mountains, even to the same trees used by their forefathers. During the spring migration they return to their original homes directly, or by multiple generations. Their offspring, from eggs deposited enroute by spring migrant, follow the same migration route as their forefathers and arrive in the same general area as their migrating parents” (Poirier, *From Darkness to Light to Flight*, p. 44).

“This means that a remarkable system of information is bound up in the genetic coding of each butterfly, such that it ‘knows’ at what stage of the migrating cycle the group of butterflies is in. Such a delicate mechanism shouts intelligent design!” (Dr. Andrew McIntosh, Reader in Combustion Theory, Department of Fuel and Energy, University of Leeds, U.K., *In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, p. 167).

A seven-year study of the migration of butterflies and moths using sophisticated radar found that the silver Y moth travels only on nights when the wind blows in the right

direction. “On such nights, silver Ys, for example, can hit speeds over the ground of 90 kilometres per hour by finding the fastest-flowing high-altitude airstream and angling their flight to correct for any crosswind drift” (Bea Perks, “Long Haul: How Butterflies and Moths Go the Distance,” *New Scientist*, June 8, 2010). The research was done by a UK team of entomologists led by Jason Chapman at the Rothamsted Research in Hertfordshire. Monarchs have been seen as high as 12,000 feet.

Scientists are beginning to learn some of the biological secrets that enable migration. They have found that the butterfly uses a combination of a sun compass, skylight cues, a circadian clock, and magnetic sensing to maintain its direction (“Brain ‘GPS’ Illuminated in Migratory Monarch,” *Science Daily*, Jan. 27, 2011; “Monarch Butterflies Reveal a Novel Way in Which Animals Sense Earth’s Magnetic Field,” *Science Daily*, Jan. 27, 2010).

They have also learned that the butterfly’s antennae have an essential role in migration (“Migrating Monarch Butterflies ‘Nose’ Their Way to Mexico,” *Science Daily*, Sept. 24, 2009).

Reports such as these sometimes boast that monarch migration is being “demystified,” but this is patent nonsense. First, only the very rudiments of migration are currently known. Further, understanding the biological rudiments of migration does nothing to explain such truly mystifying things as how such an incredibly complex mechanism and process could have evolved or how it could be created through the process of metamorphosis or how an insect could know where it happens to be on earth in a migration journey (e.g., the generations that are hatched in the midst of the migration process) and where it needs to go from there.

“Imagine finding a tiny GPS unit that could navigate 3,000 miles with a destination accuracy of ten feet. Would you believe someone who claimed it had developed itself by random changes over millions of years? What if this GPS was found, not on a street, but inside the pinhead-sized brain of a

monarch butterfly? Does the place where the unit was found, whether street or butterfly brain, alter the obvious conclusion that such an instrument must have been designed by a master intelligence?" (William Pelletier, Ph.D., "Insect GPS," *Bible-Science Guy*, Jan. 1, 2010).

Beauty

Butterflies are so beautiful that they have been called "flying flowers." There are thousands of different amazing color patterns and wing shapes.

"Every one of these 20,000 species have different color patterns, and every one of them have different shaped wings. The diversity is so magnificent. If I was the greatest artist in the world there is no way I could come up with all of these patterns. It would be absolutely impossible" (Ronald Boender, *Butterfly World*, Fort Lauderdale, *Metamorphosis*, DVD).

The butterfly's colorful wings are covered with millions of shingle-like, overlapping scales, which create the color and patterns. (*Lepidoptera*, the Latin term for the butterfly order of insects, means "scaly.") Solid colors derive from pigmented scales, while the iridescent colors derive from reflective scales that ingeniously refract a particular wavelength of light. The biophotonic crystal cells are designed and arranged perfectly to absorb certain wavelengths of white light and reflect only that part of the light that is red or blue or whatever. There are tens of thousands of scales for every square centimeter of wing, and each scale was a living cell until a day or two before the butterfly emerged from its pupa. "The scales have tiny lattices and ribbed walls that are designed to cause interference patterns in light waves within the 300 to 700 nanometer range--exactly the range humans see as color."

"We have found by using the electron microscope that there are structures there that can have no more variation than .00004 millimeters, a wonderful testament to God's design" (Frank Sherwin, zoologist, *God of Wonders*, DVD).

Wings

The butterfly's wings are covered with approximately one million scales brilliantly arrayed like shingles, which not only assist in the creature's aerodynamic efficiency and provide color patterns, but also act as tiny solar panels to provide heat to warm the flight muscles of the cold-blooded creature. "The scales are filled with air, giving them a low density, which enables the insect to fly more easily" (Poirier, p. 33).

The monarch can fly as fast as 30 miles per hour in still air and has been clocked at 50 miles per hour soaring along with thermal updrafts.

Egg

"The eggs are remarkable in themselves. They have species-specific architectures, some of which are just astonishing. The monarch egg has a beautiful symmetrical structure. It looks like a little miniature dome or cathedral" (Paul Nelson, Biola University, *Metamorphosis*, DVD). Jules Poirier, an electronics engineer, says that under a microscope the monarch egg "looks like a multifaceted diamond gem."

The egg adheres to the leaf by a powerful adhesive produced by the butterfly, and it is coated with a wax layer that protects from moisture.

Each type of butterfly lays its eggs on a specific host plant, on which the caterpillars are dependent for food. They can't survive on the wrong type of plant. The female butterfly is equipped to find the host plant from miles away through its incredible sense of smell, and as it gets closer it can identify the right leaf from its shape. It also tests the leaf with its feet and proboscis and antennae.

Pollination

The butterfly pollinates the milkweed plant when the pollen attaches to its legs. Once removed from the flower the pollen re-orientes itself in preparation for depositing on another flower. As it dries, its little arms bend so that they fit perfectly into a stigmatic groove.

Miscellaneous Facts

The monarch butterfly has two compound **EYES**, each with 6,000 perfectly shaped and arranged lenses connected to the optic nerve, and a brain that can decipher 72,000 nerve impulses from the eyes (James Perloff, *Tornado in a Junkyard*, p. 37). “The eyes of the monarch butterfly can see every color a human can see, plus ultraviolet light. ... Flowers that reflect ultraviolet light attract monarchs more frequently than other flowers” (Poirier, *From Darkness to Light to Flight*, p. 35). The round shape of the eye and its protrusion from the butterfly’s head provides a field of view that exceeds 180 degrees. The monarch’s eyes, by an incredibly complex mechanism, can also detect light polarization and is thought to use this ability to determine the direction of the sun, even on cloudy days, during migration.

The butterfly has a **PROBOSCIS**, which is a double-tubed feeding “straw” that it uses to suck nectar from flowers. It is an amazing organ. After the butterfly emerges, it unerringly knits the two tubes together by microscopic hooks. The proboscis can be rolled up for flight and extended at will. Muscles in the butterfly’s head create suction to draw up the liquid. There are smell and taste sensors at the tip of the proboscis that guide it to the nectar.

The butterfly’s **ANTENNAE** are delicate and complex sensor organs. The female’s are tipped with red smell sensors that can sense the male’s perfume from as far as two miles away. The antennae are also used to smell flowers for food and to locate the right milkweed leaves for laying eggs. The butterfly uses this sensory equipment to analyze the chemical makeup of a leaf. The antennae are also used for balance; if one is removed, the insect flies in circles. And as we have seen, the antennae are also used for migration.

The female butterfly uses six sharp microscopic needles on her **FORELEGS** to test for the chemical composition of food. She also uses her feet which are clawed **tarsi**. “Butterfly tarsi possess a sense similar to taste: tarsai contact with sweet

liquids such as nectar causes the proboscis to uncoil, and females often scratch plants with the tarsi to find the proper host plant on which to lay eggs” (*Audubon Society Field Guide*).

If the butterfly came about by evolution, then evolution is miraculous and has all of the attributes of Almighty God!

The Trilobite

The trilobite is an extinct arthropod, a hard-shelled, segmented creature that “lived in the Earth’s ancient seas.” The name “trilobite” means “three lobed” and refers to the fact that the creature had three *longitudinal* lobes. They existed in a bewildering number of varieties, with 15-20,000 known species, ranging in size from one millimeter to over two feet in length.

Evolutionists place the trilobite in the earliest stages of life, in the so-called Cambrian layer. The earliest trilobites supposedly lived 570 million years ago and the creature is thought to have gone extinct 240 million years ago. It is considered one of the signature creatures of the Paleozoic Era. (All of this is evolutionary myth with no scientific proof. The Bible says the trilobite populated the earth from the creation week.)

Even some evolutionists admit that the trilobite “defies the theories of evolution” (“Trilobites,” Paleodirect.com).

The trilobite defies evolution in that it appears suddenly in the fossil record with no evidence of having evolved from anything else.

Evolutionary writings are filled with accounts of the trilobite, of how it “evolved,” “modified,” “developed eyes,” and such, but there is no evidence for this. The scientific evidence that it evolved from some other creature or that its complex eyes and other organs evolved is non-existent. This

proposition is based upon evolutionary assumptions and wishful thinking and not on the actual evidence.

Evolutionists admit that it “appeared suddenly” in the “Cambrian explosion.”

Dr. Andrew Snelling comments on this:

“There are no possible evolutionary ancestors to the trilobites in the rock layers beneath where the trilobites are found, for example, in the Grand Canyon. In fact, the trilobites appear in the geological record suddenly, fully formed ... There is absolutely no clue as to how the amazing complexity of trilobites arose, and thus they quite clearly argue for design and fiat creation, just as we would predict from the biblical account in Genesis” (Andrew Snelling, Ph.D. in geology from the University of Sydney, *In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, pp. 294, 295).

The Trilobite Defies Evolution in That it Was a Highly Complex Creature.

The trilobite had retractable antennae, multiple, jointed legs, and gill structures. It is thought to have had a set of gills associated with every leg. It would have had complex muscle systems to move the legs. It is thought to have had a circulation system, including a heart and lung, and a complex nervous system, as indicated by the antennae which probably had a sensory function. It had a complex brain to control all of these systems. The trilobite also underwent a series of life stages.

And it had a compound eye that gives every evidence of being a marvelous design.

“Clarkson and Levi-Setti (1975) of the University of Chicago have done some spectacular work on the optics of the trilobite eye lenses. It turns out that each lens is a doublet, that is, made up of two lenses, while the shape of the boundary between the two lenses is unlike any now in use--either by animals or humans (Shawver 1974). However, the lens shape and the interface curvature are

nearly identical to designs published independently by Descartes and Huygens in the seventeenth century. Their design had the purpose of avoiding spherical aberration and was known as the aplanatic lens. Levi-Setti pointed out that the second lens in the doublet of the trilobite eye was necessary in order that the lens system could work under water where the trilobites lived. Thus, these creatures living at the earliest stages of life used an optimal lens design that would require very sophisticated optical engineering procedures to develop today” (Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 164).

Some of the trilobites had 15,000 lenses per eye, and all of these worked together in perfect harmony to provide exceptional vision for this “simple” creature.

In spite of evolutionary claims that “trilobites developed one of the first sophisticated visual systems in the animal kingdom,” there is no evidence that the trilobite eye or any other eye evolved. The eye is found intact on countless fossilized creatures reaching back to the supposed earliest stages of the fossil record, and the eye appears fully formed in countless varieties, but there is absolutely no evidence that one type of eye evolved from another. To lay out a display of eyes from “simple” to more complex is not evidence for evolution. It could just as well prove that each particular eye was designed by God for that particular creature.

In the “Cambrian layer” there are many types of creatures with many different types of eyes, and there is zero scientific evidence that any of the eyes evolved from something “simpler.” The only “evidence” is speculation and evolutionary assumptions.

Those who claim that the trilobite eye “evolved” provide no scientific method whereby such a miracle could occur by “blind” chance. Not only would it be necessary for the bewilderingly complex physical mechanism of the eye itself to have evolved, but it would also have been necessary to have evolved also the accompanying complex wiring in the

brain with its mysterious ability to receive and interpret visual signals. And all of this had to “evolve” at the DNA level.

The mind-boggling complexity of creatures at every level of the fossil record disproves evolution.

In fact, modern biology has taught us that there is no such thing as a “simple creature” even at the most microscopic level, but this was evident in the fossil record all along.

The Trilobite Gives Evidence for the Biblical Flood.

The trilobite provides evidence for the Flood, first, through its rapid fossilization. The incredible detail of the fossils, even to the retention of microscopic detail in the compound eyes, proves that the creature was subject to a catastrophic process of fossilization as opposed to a uniformitarian one. The fossils demonstrate that living trilobites were fossilized so quickly that they were still moving! The fossil trilobite that I own, a Hollardops from the Atlas Mountains of Morocco, was fossilized while swimming. The fossil is fully inflated, meaning it died and was fossilized in an instant.

The trilobite provides evidence for the Flood, second, because even though the trilobite was a sea creature it has been found in mountains and deserts throughout the world, on every continent, including the Sahara Desert, mountains in Morocco, in Nevada, Arizona (the Grand Canyon), Indiana, New York, Oklahoma, Ohio, Ontario, South America, England, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Spain, Russia, Siberia, and China--proving that the earth was once covered by the sea!

Only a worldwide catastrophe of biblical proportions can explain the trilobite fossils.

In the trilobite God's existence is indeed “clearly seen” -- unless one is willfully blind.

The Living Cell

“The complexity of the simplest known type of cell is so great that it is impossible to accept that such an object could have been thrown together suddenly by some kind of freakish, vastly improbable, event. Such an occurrence would be indistinguishable from a miracle” (Dr. Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*).

All plant life, animal tissues and organs are composed of cells. This began to be discovered in the 1830s, but man’s knowledge of cellular life has exploded since the latter half of the 20th century.

In Darwin’s day, it was thought that the cell was a very simple thing. Ernst Haeckel called it “a simple little lump of albuminous combination of carbon” (Haeckel, *The History of Creation*, 1868).

Haeckel was wrong, and the very complexity of the living cell has convinced many scientists that life could *not* have evolved.

“I believe in a Creator because I see the Creator’s designs in nature everywhere and evidence of intelligence in the DNA of each cell” (John Kramer, Ph.D. in biochemistry, *In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, p. 54).

“Though I once embraced the evolutionary paradigm, its inadequate explanations for the origin of life coupled with the sophistication and complexity of the cell’s chemical systems convinced me as a biochemistry graduate student that a Creator must exist” (Fazale Rana, Ph.D. in chemistry, *The Cell’s Design*, p. 17).

“Complexity of the cell is now just too daunting to flippantly assert biochemical evolution to explain it, unless you close your mind and press on blindly and boldly. It has now become quite a feat to think about cells originating through biochemical evolution. And if cells could not originate naturally, then nothing else

could” (Henry Zuill, Ph.D. in biology, *In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, p. 68).

The living cell is a fantastically complex thing, more complex than a modern city. It’s a living body with organs called organelles. It has blueprints, decoders, error checkers, quality control systems, power plants (mitochondria), power storage units, manufacturing plants (cytoplasm, endoplasmic reticulum, Golgi apparatus), chemical plants, assembly lines, disposal units (proteasome), trash compactors, a complex communication system, recycling centers (lysosomes), detoxification plants (peroxisomes), transportation highways and tracks and tunnels, transportation vehicles (dynein), living walls with many types of one-way and two-way guarded, gated portals to the outside world, an external matrix to connect with other cells, and a host of other things. It is living and reproducing and not only makes its own machinery but also its own raw materials.

Michael Denton describes the complexity of the cell as follows:

“To grasp the reality of life as it has been revealed by molecular biology, we must magnify a cell a thousand million times until it is twenty kilometres in diameter and resembles a giant airship large enough to cover a great city like London or New York. What we would then see would be an object of unparalleled complexity and adaptive design. On the surface of the cell we would see millions of openings, like the port holes of a vast space ship, opening and closing to allow a continual stream of materials to flow in and out. If we were to enter one of these openings we would find ourselves in a world of supreme technology and bewildering complexity. We would see endless highly organized corridors and conduits branching in every direction away from the perimeter of the cell, some leading to the central memory bank in the nucleus and others to assembly plants and processing units. The nucleus itself would be a vast spherical chamber more than a kilometre in diameter,

resembling a geodesic dome inside of which we would see, all neatly stacked together in ordered arrays, the miles of coiled chains of the DNA molecules. A huge range of products and raw materials would shuttle along all the manifold conduits in a highly ordered fashion to and from all the various assembly plants in the outer regions of the cell. ...

“We would see around us, in every direction we looked, all sorts of robot-like machines. We would notice that the simplest of the functional components of the cell, the protein molecules, were astonishingly, complex pieces of molecular machinery, each one consisting of about three thousand atoms arranged in highly organized 3-D spatial conformation. We would wonder even more as we watched the strangely purposeful activities of these weird molecular machines, particularly when we realized that, despite all our accumulated knowledge of physics and chemistry, the task of designing one such molecular machine--that is one single functional protein molecule--would be completely beyond our capacity at present and will probably not be achieved until at least the beginning of the next century. ...

“We would see that nearly every feature of our own advanced machines had its analogue in the cell: artificial languages and their decoding systems, memory banks for information storage and retrieval, elegant control systems regulating the automated assembly of parts and components, error fail-safe and proof-reading devices utilized for quality control, assembly processes involving the principle of prefabrication and modular construction. In fact, so deep would be the feeling of *deja-vu*, so persuasive the analogy, that much of the terminology we would use to describe this fascinating molecular reality would be borrowed from the world of late twentieth-century technology” (*Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, 1986, pp. 328, 329).

The cell contains not only the blueprint of the plant or animal's body and the information describing its every function but also the ability to actually fashion and operate it.

A typical cell contains more than a trillion parts at the atomic level (Jerry Bergman, Ph.D. biology, *In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, p. 25)

Even a "simple" *E. coli* bacterium has about 4,640,000 nucleotide base pairs, which code for 4,288 genes, each one of which produces an enormously complex protein machine (Bergman, p. 25)

There are 200 major types of cells in the human body and each one contains the complete DNA needed to create the entire body. Each cell uses only that part of the DNA instructions necessary to accomplish its particular function.

The information in the DNA in one human cell is equivalent to a library of 4,000 books (each containing 500 pages), yet all of the DNA from every person who has ever lived would weigh less than an aspirin tablet (Walt Brown, *In the Beginning*).

If the information contained in all of the cells of the human body were reduced to books, they would fill the 800 cubic miles of the Grand Canyon 98 times (Brown, p. 75).

"A live reading of the DNA in one cell at a rate of one letter per second would take thirty-one years, even if reading continued day and night. Printing these letters out in regular font size on normal bond paper and binding them all together would result in a tower the height of the Washington Monument" (Francis Collins, *The Language of God*).

The amount of information that could be stored in a pinhead's volume of DNA is equivalent to a pile of paperback books 500 times as tall as the distance from earth to the moon, each with a different, yet specific, content (W. Gitt, "Dazzling Design in Miniature," *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Dec. 1997 - Feb. 1998, p. 6).

One gram of DNA can house as much information as nearly one trillion CDs (Fazale Rana, *The Cell's Design*, p. 164).

There are 60 trillion cells in the human body.

ATP is Necessary for Life

The living cell is powered by ATP (Adenosine TriPhosphate), which is produced in the cell's mitochondria by an amazing genetic motor called **ATP Synthase**. Without ATP there would be no biological life and without the ATP motor there would be no ATP. One trillion trillion of these complex motors would fit on the head of a pin. They typically spin at about 10,000 rpm and develop immense torque, with each rotation producing three ATP molecules.

“The human body generates about its own weight of ATP every day, generated by trillions of these motors. And it is consumed very quickly to power vital biochemical reactions, including DNA and protein synthesis, muscle contraction, transport of nutrients and nerve impulses. An organism without ATP is like a car without gasoline. Cyanide is so toxic precisely because it stops ATP production. ... because energy is vital for life, life could not have evolved before this motor was fully functional. This is an even more foundational problem: natural selection by definition is differential reproduction, so requires self-reproducing entities at the start. Yet self-reproduction requires ATP to supply the energy! So does the expression of the information that is selected. So even if a series of gradual steps could be imagined up this peak of ‘Mount Improbable,’ there would be no natural selection to enable that climb. This is because all the hypothetical intermediates would be lacking energy and thus dead” (Jonathan Sarfati, *By Design*, pp. 135, 136).

Shem Dharampaul, M.D., observes: “In the glycolytic pathway which produces ATP, you need to input two molecules of ATP to produce four molecules of ATP (net

product of two molecules). It is a classic chicken and egg scenario. From where did the first two molecules appear?”

A graphical depiction of the ATP synthase can be viewed at <http://4simpsons.wordpress.com/2010/11/22/an-86-second-example-of-intelligent-design>.

Proteins are Necessary for Life

Cells are largely made up of proteins (about a million per cell in thousands of varieties), and cells and proteins in turn form the body. Proteins “are the machines within living tissue that build the structures and carry out the chemical reactions necessary for life” (Michael Behe, *Darwin’s Black Box*).

Muscles, skin, hair, eyes, antibodies, enzymes (that produce essential chemical reactions such as breaking down sugar), and hormones are made of proteins. Blood clotting is accomplished by the proteins fibrinogen and thrombin. Hemoglobin in the red blood cell is a protein that allows oxygen to be transported to every part of the body. The proteins collagen and keratin, which are elastic and stronger than steel, make up skin, hair, and fingernails, as well as the structural support within the cell itself.

The cell can make thousands of different types of proteins, each one amazingly complex in itself and designed for a specific function. For example, there are hundreds of types of proteins that bridge the cell membrane to act as gates and transporters.

First the DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid) makes three kinds of RNA (ribonucleic acid). The RNA then reads the DNA’s complicated code, knowing exactly where to start and how to accomplish this task, working with the cell’s various organs to create proteins according to the master blueprint. This process is complex beyond words, and scientists are only beginning to understand small parts of it.

Each protein is composed of a long string of 20 different amino acids, typically thousands in length, and each amino acid must be in exactly the right sequence for the protein to

work. After the protein is strung together, it is folded and shaped perfectly within the cell's factories and then transported to the right place. The right shaping is essential.

Proteins require DNA for formation, but DNA is itself made up of proteins.

“Because DNA and proteins depend so intimately on each other for their survival, it’s hard to imagine one of them having evolved first. But it’s just as implausible for them to have emerged simultaneously out of a prebiotic soup” (Carl Zimmer, “How and Where Did Life on Earth Arise?” *Science*, Vol. 309, July 1, 2005, p. 89).

“A quick summation will reveal that the process of converting DNA information into proteins requires at least 75 different protein molecules. But each and every one of these 75 proteins must be synthesized in the first place by the process in which they themselves are involved. How could the process begin without the presence of all the necessary proteins? ... without proteins life would not exist; it is as simple as that. The same is true of DNA and RNA. It should be clear that DNA, RNA, and proteins must all be present if any of them are going to be present in a living organism. Life must have been created completely functional, or it would be a meaningless mess. To suggest otherwise is plain ignorance (or perhaps desperation). So, we truly have a ‘which came first?’ problem on our hands. I believe the answer is, of course, that none of them came first! God came first; He designed and then created all of life with His spoken Word. DNA, RNA, and protein came all at exactly the same time. It is extremely difficult to understand how anyone could believe that this astoundingly complicated DNA-blueprint translation system happened to come about by chance” (John Marcus, Ph.D. in biological chemistry from the University of Michigan, *In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, p. 177).

Enzymes are Necessary for Life

The cell also requires the activity of proteins called enzymes, which are catalysts that facilitate and speed up chemical reactions.

Michael Pitman, who taught biology at Cambridge, writes:

“‘Living matter,’ comments leading enzymologist M. Dixon, ‘is the most wonderful chemical system in the world.’ Part of its ‘magic’ is that it consists of a complex network of chemical reactions and processes, arranged so that the product of each reaction is the starting material of the next link in the chain. All such reactions are brought about by enzymes, of which there are many thousands. These are special proteins, each with the power of causing specific chemical reactions that would not occur in their absence. Dixon likens enzymes to automated machine tools, each of which performs one particular operation on a product and hands it on to the next. Some production lines join up, giving rise to a network of lines with many pathways--a network called metabolism. ...

“Dixon confesses that he cannot see how such a system could ever have originated spontaneously. The main difficulty is that an enzyme system does not work at all until it is complete, or nearly so. Another problem is the question of how enzymes appear without pre-existing enzymes to make them. ‘The association between enzymes and life,’ Dixon writes, ‘is so intimate that the problem of the origin of life itself is largely that of the origin of enzymes.’ ...

“Certain basic pathways are common to all living systems and must have been present since life began. The glycolytic pathway in which sugar is broken down, releasing energy, is one example; respiration and many other functions basic to life also depend upon networks of metabolic pathways, usually involving dozens of complex stages, which are recognizable throughout the plant and animal kingdoms. ...

“Enzyme systems are doing every minute what battalions of full-time chemists cannot. The mechanisms of their actions are only just beginning to be understood and we cannot yet manipulate them with any confidence. The idea of designing enzymes for specific purposes, then synthesizing them, is futuristic. This may come: if it does it will be the product of very concentrated thought and manipulative skill by teams of dedicated scientists. Can anyone seriously imagine that naturally occurring enzymes realized themselves, along with hundreds of specific friends, by chance? Enzymes and enzyme systems, like the genetic mechanisms whence they originate, are masterpieces of sophistication” (Pitman, *Adam and Evolution*, pp. 144, 145).

Enzymes speed up living processes that would otherwise be impossible. The phosphatase enzyme, for example, catalyzes the hydrolysis or splitting of phosphate bonds, which are necessary for cellular life.

“This enzyme allows reactions vital for cell signaling and regulation to take place in a hundredth of a second. Without the enzyme, this essential reaction would take a trillion years--almost a hundred times even the supposed evolutionary age of the universe (about 15 billion years)” (Jonathan Sarfati, *By Design*, p. 157).

DNA Editing Machinery is Necessary for Life

The DNA copying and reading process has complex editing ability.

“The copying is far more precise than pure chemistry could manage--only about 1 mistake in 10 billion letters, because there is editing (proof-reading and error-checking) machinery, again encoded in the DNA. But how would the information for editing machinery be transmitted accurately before this machinery was in place? Lest it be argued that the accuracy could be achieved stepwise through selection, note that a high degree of accuracy is needed to prevent ‘error

catastrophe'--the accumulation of 'noise' in the form of junk proteins. Again there is a vicious circle, a 'Catch-22' (more irreducible complexity)" (Sarfati, *By Design*, p. 163).

Chemical Pathways and Barriers are Necessary for Life

Walt Brown, Ph.D. in mechanical engineering from MIT, observes:

"Living cells contain thousands of different chemicals, some acidic, others basic. Many chemicals would react with others were it not for an intricate system of chemical barriers and buffers. If living things evolved, these barriers and buffers must also have evolved--but at just the right time to prevent harmful chemical reactions. How could such precise, seemingly coordinated, virtually miraculous events have happened for each of millions of species?" (*In the Beginning*, p. 15).

These are just a few of the terribly complex features of the living cell which point directly to an Almighty God.

The Human Eye

The bewildering complexity of the human eye speaks eloquently of an Almighty Creator.

The eye's retina is less than one square inch in surface area but it contains 137 million light-sensitive receptor cells. 130 million of these are rod cells (which see in black and white) while 7 million are cone cells (which allow color vision).

Each photoreceptor cell is vastly more complex than the most sophisticated man-made computer (Alan Gillen, *Body by Design*, p. 98). And each complex photoreceptor cell replaces itself every seven days.

The eye has a dynamic range of 10 billion to one; that is, it will detect a single photon of light and will still work well in an intensity of 10 billion photons. By contrast, modern photographic film has a dynamic range of about 1,000 to one

(Jonathan Sarfati, Ph.D., *By Design*, p. 26), and a high quality single lens reflex (DSLR) camera has a dynamic range of about 2000 to 1.

The Nikon D700 is a semi-pro grade DSLR with a top of the line exposure metering system, but the authors of *Mastering the Nikon D700* are led to comment that it “is only a weak imitation of our marvelously designed eye and brain functions” (p. 34).

A healthy eye can see the light from a single candle 25 miles away.

At every level the human eye demonstrates mind-boggling complexity.

For example, in response to bright light, a protein called arrestin rushes to “bind and calm the light-detecting proteins.” Arrestin is shuttled at lightning speed by a motor protein called myosin along special tracks of the cell’s internal skeleton (Sarfati, *By Design*, p. 27). “For the cell to properly adapt to bright light, arrestin needs to move; if it doesn’t, the cell remains as sensitive to light as it was when it was dark” (C. Montell).

“... a process called edge extraction enhances the recognition of edges of objects. John Stevens, an associate professor of physiology and biomedical engineering, pointed out that it would take ‘a minimum of a hundred years of Cray supercomputer time to simulate what takes place in your eye many times each second’ (*Byte*, April 1985)” (Sarfati, *By Design*, p. 27).

Intelligent processing occurs in the retina before the information is transmitted to the brain. It has been estimated that 10 billion calculations occur every second in the retina *before the image even gets to the brain* (Gillen).

George Marshall, Ph.D. in Ophthalmic Science from Glasgow University, says:

“The retina is probably the most complicated tissue in the whole body. Millions of nerve cells interconnect in a fantastic number of ways to form a miniature ‘brain.’

Much of what the photoreceptors 'see' is interpreted and processed by the retina long before it enters the brain" ("An Eye for Creation: An Interview with Eye-disease Researcher Dr. George Marshall," *Creation*, September 1996, <http://www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v18/i4/eye.asp>).

Even the atheist Richard Dawkins has to marvel at the complexity of the human eye, though he reaches the strange conclusion that it is the product of blind evolution:

"The optic nerve is a trunk cable, a bundle of separate 'insulated' wires, in this case about three million of them. Each of the three million wires leads from one cell in the retina to the brain. You can think of them as the wires leading from a bank of three million photocells (actually three million relay stations gathering information from an even larger number of photocells) to the computer that is to process the information in the brain" (Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, p. 93).

The eye's optic nerve can handle 1.5 million simultaneous messages that are sent to the brain where this massive amount of information is instantaneously processed.

The eyes are set in the body at the ideal place and are protected by the surrounding bone structure, by the eyelid, the eyelashes, and the eyebrows.

The eyes are self-cleaning and self-maintaining. They produce three different types of tears, each with its own complex chemical makeup. Basal tears are the normal lubricating tears that keep the eye clear of dust. The composition of these tears include lysozyme which fights against bacterial infection as part of the body's mind-bogglingly complex immune system. Reflex tears are produced to flush the eye of irritants, such as onion or pepper vapors. Emotional tears are produced as a result of emotional stress and contain a natural painkiller and calming hormones. Tears have three layers, an outer layer which contains oils that prevent evaporation and control the flow of

tears onto the cheek; a middle layer, which contains the proteins and hormones, and a mucous layer touching the eye itself which coats the cornea and provides for even distribution of the tear film.

Could the eye have evolved from a single light-sensitive spot, as evolutionists claim?

First, even a “simple” light sensitive spot that can actually discern and interpret light is incredibly complicated and could not have evolved by chance. Biologist Michael Behe observes:

“We are invited by Dawkins and Darwin to believe that the evolution of the eye proceeded step-by-step through a series of plausible intermediates in infinitesimal increments. But are they infinitesimal? Remember that the ‘light-sensitive spot’ that Dawkins takes as his starting point requires a cascade of factors, including 11-cis-retinal and rhodopsin, to function. Dawkins doesn’t mention them. And where did the ‘little cup’ come from? A ball of cells--from which the cup must be made--will tend to be rounded unless held in the correct shape by molecular supports. In fact, there are dozens of complex proteins involved in maintaining cell shape, and dozens more that control extracellular structure; in their absence, cells take on the shape of so many soap bubbles. Do these structures represent single-step mutations? Dawkins did not tell us how the apparently simple ‘cup’ shape came to be. And although he reassures us that any ‘translucent material’ would be an improvement ... we are not told how difficult it is to produce a ‘simple lens.’ In short, Dawkins’s explanation is only addressed to the level of what is called gross anatomy. ...

“Biochemistry has demonstrated that any biological apparatus involving more than one cell (such as an organ or a tissue) is necessarily an intricate web of many different, identifiable systems of horrendous complexity. ... Not only is the eye exceedingly complex, but the ‘light-sensitive spot’ with which Dawkins begins

his case is itself a multicelled organ, each of whose cells makes the complexity of a motorcycle or television set look paltry in comparison. ...

“Richard Dawkins can simplify to his heart’s content, because he wants to convince his readers that Darwinian evolution is ‘a breeze.’ In order to understand the barriers to evolution, however, we have to bite the bullet of complexity” (*Darwin’s Black Box*).

Second, the eye appears in the fossil record in great variety and amazing complexity (e.g., trilobite and shrimp eyes), far beyond a “simple light spot.” There is no evidence that complex eyes evolved from simple eyes.

Further, not only does sight require exceedingly complicated biological machinery, but there must be the accompanying intelligence to interpret the light signals and this must be coordinated with further complex systems that enable the creature to do something with the information. Darwinists have never demonstrated how these things evolved.

For a study of the supposed backwards wiring of the human eye see “The Imperfect Human Eye” under the section on Icons of Evolution.

The Human Brain

The human brain is “the most complex arrangement of matter in the universe” (Dr. Duane Gish, *Evolution*).

The information in the brain equals that contained in 20 million separate books (George Cahill, *Science Digest*, Vol. 89, issue 3, 1981, p. 105).

It has about 200 billion nerve cells with hundreds of trillions of connections called synapses. Each synapse functions like a microprocessor “with both memory-storage and information-processing elements” (Cornelius Hunter, “More Switches Than the Internet,” *Darwin’s God*, Nov. 17, 2010). One synapse may contain 1,000 switches. In the

cerebral cortex alone there are 125 trillion synapses, which is about how many stars would fill 1,500 Milky Way galaxies.

“The brain’s total number of connections rivals the stars of the universe in number, yet the connections follow an orderly plan” (Alan Gillen, *Body by Design*, p. 87).

There are 100 billion glia cells which provide the biological “batteries” for brain activity (*The Revelation of God and Nature*).

The brain receives signals from 137 million light receptors in the eyes, 100,000 hearing receptors in the ears, 3,000 taste buds, 30,000 heat sensors on the skin, 250,000 cold sensors, and 500,000 touch sensors (Bert Thompson, *The Revelation of God and Nature*). The hearing receptors alone send up to 25,000 auditory signals per second to the brain, which interprets them as voices, thunder, music, or a million other sounds (Jackson, *The Human Body*).

The brain receives 20% of all of the blood pumped from the heart.

The brain produces over 50 different complex drugs needed to control our body, emotions, and thoughts. For example, endorphin, the brain’s pain-killer, is three times more potent than morphine (*A Closer Look at the Evidence*).

The Human Hand

The following is excerpted from “Made in His Image: The Connecting Power of Hands,” R. Guliuzza, M.D., Institute for Creation Research:

“Human finger movements excel in precision and *speed*. The average time a person takes to make a common choice between two things is about half of a second. But rapid finger motions are much faster--in fact even faster than is physically possible using only the body’s sensor-to-motor loops. To obtain the highest possible finger speeds, sensors and conscious thought are augmented in the brain with an *anticipatory function* for individual

finger movements called a *forward plan*, which is extraordinarily complex and significantly subconscious. Evidence shows that the central nervous system predicts the best outcome of every finger movement *several movements ahead* of its current state. Thus, skilled typists will visually process up to eight characters *in advance* and then--in anticipation--the forward plan for muscle movements will commit the finger muscles to an action about three characters in advance of actually striking the keys. Times between keystrokes are commonly as low as 60 milliseconds. Interestingly, speed is fastest if successive keystrokes are between fingers on opposite hands. So imagine the quantity of mental data processed for a skilled pianist who can play 20-30 successive notes with each hand every second--about 40 milliseconds apart--since the nervous system executes a forward plan (prescribing speed, direction, pressure, duration, etc.) for *every* finger *simultaneously* and updates all plans after *every* successive finger movement. The plan is compiled in the cerebellum, which may, if needed, retain memory of the plan (one or several varieties). This becomes an integral part of skilled learning. So far, no limits have been found on the number of plans that can be kept in memory.”

The following is excerpted from Craig Beidler, “Proof of God in the Palm of Your Hand,” *The Real Truth*, Dec. 20, 2009:

“Sir Isaac Newton once said, ‘In the absence of any other proof, the thumb alone would convince me of God’s existence.’ ... In his book *Fearfully and Wonderfully Made*, Dr. Paul Brand, who was one of the foremost hand surgeons in the world, testifies to the wonder—the miracle—of the human body. Dr. Brand explained that although many people think that fat serves no significant purpose, it does on the hand. ‘Underneath the skin in the palm of the hand lie globules of fat with the look and consistency of tapioca pudding. Fat globules, so soft as to be almost fluid, cannot hold their own shape, and so they

are surrounded by interwoven fibrils of collagen, like balloons caught in a supporting rope net...where stress occurs, such as on the palm of the hand, fat is tightly gathered and enveloped by fibrous tissue in a design resembling fine Belgian lace.' When you grasp a hammer in the palm of your hand, each 'cluster of fat cells changes its shape in response to the pressure. It yields but cannot be pushed aside because of the firm collagen fibers around it. The resulting tissue, constantly shifting and quivering, becomes compliant, fitting its shape and its stress points to the precise shape of the handle of the hammer. Engineers nearly shout when they analyze this amazing property, for they cannot design a material that so perfectly balances elasticity with viscosity.' The skin of the hand is also well suited to the task of gripping and handling different kinds of objects. Dr. Brand wrote, 'If my skin tissue had been made harder, I might insensitively crush a goblet of fine crystal as I hold it in my hand; if softer, it would not allow a firm grip.' ... Another remarkable feature of a normal hand is its sensitivity. Dr. Brand states, 'A normal hand can distinguish between a smooth plane of glass and one etched with lines only 1/2500 of an inch deep.' The fingertips have the ability to detect a difference of just three milligrams. How extraordinary it is that the hand should be so well-suited for its purpose through all of these amazing features and abilities. Was this the product of chance or the creation of God?"

Blood Clotting

Blood clotting is an example of a wonderful biological system that could not have evolved in stages.

The clotting mechanism is necessary for survival in animals and humans, because the blood circulation system is pressurized, and a simple cut or wound would prove fatal if the bleeding were not stopped.

Hemophilia is a life-threatening disease in which part of the clotting apparatus is crippled.

When a cut occurs, molecular signals cause various proteins to activate to create a complex meshwork that entraps the blood cells, forming the initial clot.

Clotting involves over 30 distinct individual reactions, each of which is vital to heal a wound and each of which is exceedingly complex. The coordination, order, timing, and rates of action must be exact. Omitting even one of the reactions, inserting an unwanted step, or altering the timing of a step would result in death.

This is why the blood clotting system is called “a cascade, a system where one component activates another component” (Alan Gillen, *Body by Design*, p. 74).

- The clot must form quickly.
- It must form the full length of the wound with sufficient coverage to stop the bleeding.
- It must form only in the precise location of a wound and only enough to close the wound and not close down the blood vessels (otherwise it could block circulation, which is what causes heart attacks and strokes).
- The wound must be cleansed of germs and damaged cellular tissues. This is accomplished by an increase in the flow of blood enriched with white blood cells.
- The clotting process must not only stop the flow of blood but also develop a new skin cover for permanent healing. The surrounding skin cells increase the rate of reproduction to create a bridge of new skin.
- At the precise time when healing is completed, other protein machinery must remove the clot.

The intricate process begins with the creation of a protein mesh to close the wound and trap the blood. It is composed of a protein called fibrinogen that is carried in the blood plasma. Another protein, thrombin, slices pieces of fibrinogen to create fibrin and connect them together to form

a network. Long threads criss-cross the fibrin to entrap the blood cells.

Consider the amazing intelligence and communication that is involved throughout this process at the cellular level.

Russell Doolittle has tried to provide an evolutionary scenario for the blood clotting system, but biologist Michael Behe demonstrates that Doolittle's scenario is simply a "just-so" story.

"What he has done is to hypothesize a series of steps in which clotting proteins appear one after another. Yet, as I will show in the next section, the explanation is seriously inadequate because no reasons are given for the appearance of the proteins, no attempt is made to calculate the probability of the proteins' appearance, and no attempt is made to estimate the new proteins' properties. ...

"The first thing to notice is that no causative factors are cited. Thus tissue factor 'appears,' fibrinogen 'is born,' antiplasmin 'arises,' TPA 'springs forth,' a cross-linking protein 'is unleashed,' and so forth. What exactly, we might ask, is causing all this springing and unleashing? Doolittle appears to have in mind a step-by-step Darwinian scenario involving the undirected, random duplication and recombination of gene pieces. But consider the enormous amount of luck needed to get the right gene pieces in the right places. ...

"The second question to consider is the implicit assumption that a protein made from a duplicated gene would immediately have the new, necessary properties. ...

"The third problem in the blood-coagulation scenario is that it avoids the crucial issues of how much, how fast, when, and where. Nothing is said about the amount of clotting material initially available, the strength of the clot that would be formed by a primitive system, the length of time the clot would take to form once a cut occurred, what fluid pressure the clot would resist, how detrimental

the formation of inappropriate clots would be, or a hundred other such questions” (*Darwin’s Black Box*, chapter 4).

The blood clotting system cannot have emerged piecemeal. Dean Kenyon, Ph.D. in biophysics from Stanford University, observes:

“In fact, having a primitive, poorly controlled clotting system would probably be more dangerous to an animal, and therefore less advantageous, than having no such system at all! ... It is important to realize that no one has ever offered a credible hypothesis to explain how the blood clotting system could have started and subsequently evolved. ...

“Virtually all biochemical systems, large and small, exhibit coherent integration of distinct parts to give a whole entity with a separate purpose. This includes photosynthesis, cell replication, carbohydrate, protein, and lipid metabolism, vision, the immune system, and numerous others. Like a car engine, biological systems can only work after they have been assembled by someone who knows what the final result will be” (Davis and Kenyon, *Of Pandas and People*, p. 145).

The Pasteur Experiments

The 19th-century experiments of Louis Pasteur proved that life does not spontaneously generate, which is powerful evidence *against* evolution and *for* the Bible.

In his book *The History of Creation*, German evolutionist Ernst Haeckel said, “If we do not accept the hypothesis of spontaneous generation, then at this one point of the history of development we must have recourse in the miracle of a supernatural creation.”

Many people in Charles Darwin’s day believed that life could generate spontaneously. Called “abiogenesis,” it was

thought, for example, that maggots were spontaneously generated in rotting meat or in apples.

Evolutionists proposed this process as the answer to how life arose, but Louis Pasteur (1822-95) disproved the hypothesis. In the 1860s, he was assigned by Emperor Louis Napoleon III to find a solution to the problem that the French wine industry was having with the fermentation process. It was thought that fermentation was simply a matter of chemicals combining (grape sugar turning to alcohol and carbonic acid gas) and producing microbes. This would be abiogenesis, but Pasteur disproved it. In experiments lasting two years, he demonstrated that it is yeast, which is a living microbe and a type of fungus, that causes fermentation (Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 177). Unknown to the wine makers, the yeast was introduced into the process on the skins of the grapes. Pasteur also demonstrated that the air naturally contains minute living organisms known as bacteria that can multiply under the right conditions. He invented the process of pasteurization to kill the germs in milk and other liquids by heating.

Life is already present. It is not spontaneously generated!

All research since Pasteur has confirmed his conclusion that life does not come into existence from non-life. Such a thing has never been witnessed or demonstrated. As we will see, the result of the Miller experiment was more like a sad joke than evidence for abiogenesis.

Former evolutionist Dr. Arthur Wilder-Smith, who debated various leading scientists throughout the world on this subject, said:

“The Evolutionary model says that it is not necessary to assume the existence of anything, besides matter and energy, to produce life. That proposition is unscientific. We know perfectly well that if you leave matter to itself, it does not organize itself--in spite of all the efforts in recent years to prove that it does” (Wilder-Smith, in Willem J.J.

Glashouwer and Paul S. Taylor, *The Origin of the Universe*, 1983).

Artificial Breeding Experiments

Charles Darwin used his breeding experiments with pigeons in an attempt to prove that natural selection explains “the Origin of Species.” He could only get away with this by defining “species” as a variety of a particular kind of animal, such as a type of pigeon or a type of dog, because in fact artificial breeding provides powerful evidence *against* Darwin’s doctrine and *for* creation.

Artificial breeding experiments provide a powerful proof of the Bible, which says that God made plants and animals to reproduce only according to their kind (Genesis 1:21, 24, 25).

In the 150 years since Darwin wrote *On the Origin of Species*, a fantastic amount of money and effort has been dedicated to artificial breeding experiments. The field of artificial selection constitutes a massive scientific experiment that tests the reality of Darwin’s principles. Modern agriculture has used such experiments to produce new strains of plants and animals that are more disease resistant, more beautiful, more delicious, faster, taller, fatter, smaller, woolier.

What has this vast field of experimentation proven?

1. There are genetic barriers that cannot be crossed.

Through the process of artificial selection, corn has never become wheat or dogs become sheep.

This thoroughly-tested, scientifically-demonstrated fact even has a scientific name: *genetic homeostasis*.

Throughout the 19th century breeding experiments raised the sugar content of beets, from four percent to an impressive seventeen percent, but at that point a barrier was reached and no further benefit has been achieved. This research began in France in 1811, when France was denied the import of cane sugar because of its war with other European nations.

Napoleon enlisted top French botanists to breed a beet containing the maximum amount of sugar. They were very successful, increasing the beet sugar content many fold, but eventually reaching a biological barrier.

The famous plant breeder Luther Burbank concluded that the barriers are in the genetic code:

“Luther Burbank, perhaps the most famous plant breeder in the history of the United States, once pointed out that nobody had succeeded in growing black tulips or blue roses, because the genetic material was simply not there. ‘I know from experience that I can develop a plum half an inch long or one two-and-a-half inches long, with every possible length in between, but I am willing to admit that it is hopeless to try to get a plum the size of a small pea, or one as big as a grapefruit. I have roses that bloom pretty steadily for six months of the year, but I have none that will bloom twelve, and I will not have. **In short, there are limits to the development possible.**’ The reason for reaching these evolutionary dead ends is not hard to find: the genetic code in each living thing has its own built-in limitations. ... Every series of breeding experiments that has ever taken place has established a finite limit to breeding possibilities. Genes are a strong influence for conservatism, and allow only modest change” (Francis Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe*, pp. 38, 39).

Francis Hitching observes that artificial breeding demonstrates that there are biological systems at the genetic level that resist change:

“On the face of it, then, the prime function of the genetic system would seem to be to resist change: to perpetuate the species in a minimally adapted form in response to altered conditions, and if at all possible to get things back to normal. The role of natural selection is usually a negative one: to destroy the few mutant individuals that threaten the stability of the species” (Hitching, p. 41).

Dr. David Berlinski concludes that artificial breeding proves that the Darwinian process of natural selection cannot account for species to species change.

“This is the conclusion suggested by more than six thousand years of artificial selection, the practice of barnyard and backyard alike. Nothing can induce a chicken to lay a square egg or to persuade a pig to develop wheels mounted on ball bearings. It would be a violation, as chickens and pigs are prompt to observe and often with indignation, of their essential nature. **If species have an essential nature that beyond limits cannot change, then random variations and natural selection cannot change them.** We must look elsewhere for an account that does justice to their nature or to the facts” (David Berlinski, *The Devil’s Delusion*, p. 189).

A research paper on plants in *Floriculture and Ornamental Biotechnology* (December 2010) favorably cites “intelligent design” because of the failure of breeding experiments to support Darwinism. The paper, authored by biologist Wolf-Ekkehard Lönning of the Planck Institute for Plant Breeding Research in Germany, observes that “billions of induced mutations” have failed to prove that plants can produce “a range of new systematic species.”

Instead, the breeding experiments demonstrate that there is a limit to the amount of change that can be induced in plants.

2. Variations and mutations are quickly diluted by the larger population.

Any change that happens in a species is typically diluted by the larger population. This was remarked during Darwin’s lifetime by Fleming Jenkin, the partner of Sir William Thomson (Lord Kelvin).

“He showed that no single variation could survive being blended back into an ocean of normal peers. Blood always mixes; a white sailor with a black wife has ‘mulatto’

children. No old salt marooned on African shores, however resourceful and superior, was going to 'blanch a nation of negroes.' Boat-loads of whites were needed. As Jenkin said, only if many simultaneous 'sports' or mutations appeared and bred true could a species change" (Adrian Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 547).

And even this "species change" would be very limited in scope.

3. Changes introduced by breeding are reversed by nature.

"When domesticated animals return to the wild state, the most highly specialized breeds quickly perish and the survivors revert to the original wild type. Natural selection is a conservative force that prevents the appearance of the extremes of variation that human breeders like to encourage" (Phillip Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, p. 18).

"Left to their own devices, artificially bred species usually die out (because they are sterile or less robust) or quickly revert to the norm" (Francis Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe*, p. 39).

Ernst Mayr's research in fruit flies demonstrated the tendency of nature to reverse artificial breeding experiments:

"Ernst Mayr, who remains convinced that small-scale gene substitution is the answer to evolution, conducted one striking piece of research on *Drosophila* [the fruit fly] which, ironically, seemed to demonstrate the opposite. He selectively bred successive generations of flies to try to increase or decrease the number of bristles they grew, normally averaging thirty-six. He reached a lower limit, after thirty generations, of twenty-five bristles; and an upper limit after twenty generations, of fifty-six bristles. After that the flies rapidly began to die out. Then, Mayr brought back nonselective breeding, letting nature take its course. Within five years, the bristle count was almost back to average" (Francis Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe*, p. 41).

We see this in the famous Galapagos finch. During drought conditions, when only big tough seeds are available, those finches with larger beaks survive better than those with smaller and thus become more predominant in the population, but when the drought condition ends the finch population reverts back to normal.

4. Natural genetic traits are stubborn and can reappear even when it seems that they have been bred out.

Consider Thomas Hunt Morgan's experiments with the fruit fly. He produced endless varieties of color and form. He even developed a strain of eyeless flies. "But when Morgan carried the experiment further, inbreeding this new eyeless strain, he found that within a short time, perfectly formed eyes appeared" (William Fix, *The Bone Peddlers*, p. 190).

5. Calling something a new "species" does not disprove the Bible's teaching that kind reproduces kind (Genesis 1:11, 21, 24).

When modern breeders produce hybrids of corn or roses or birds that can be crossed with one another but not with the parent, they call this a new species and give it a new name. But this is not the same as a biblical "kind" and it does not disprove the Bible. To disprove the Bible's teaching about kind through artificial breeding would require that a dog become a pig or corn a rose.

6. The fruit fly experiments prove that mutations do not produce anything positive or anything that could advance the evolution of a species.

The fruit fly (*Drosophila melanogaster*) has been used in genetic experiments since the early 1900s. Beginning with the work of Thomas Hunt Morgan, tens of millions of fruit flies have been artificially bred, bombarded with x-rays, frozen, blistered, doctored, and poisoned. The result has been a variety of mutant fruit flies--with different sizes of eyes, no eyes, short wings, no wings, extra wings--but no evidence

that the fruit fly could evolve into some other type of insect or animal.

“... in spite of the enormously increased mutation rates, all the fruit flies have remained fruit flies. Indeed, out of the millions of mutations, only two are arguably ‘fitter’ than the parent stock of flies, and even this is strongly debated” (Francis Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe*, p. 41).

“Morgan, Goldschmidt, Muller, and other geneticists have subjected generations of fruit flies to extreme conditions of heat, cold, light, dark, and treatment by chemicals and radiation. **All sorts of mutations, practically all trivial or positively deleterious, have been produced. Man-made evolution? Not really: Few of the geneticists' monsters could have survived outside the bottles they were bred in. In practice mutants die, are sterile, or tend to revert to the wild type**” (Michael Pitman, *Adam and Evolution*, 1984, p. 70).

“It is a striking, but not much mentioned fact that, though geneticists have been breeding fruit flies for sixty years or more in labs all around the world--flies which produce a new generation every eleven days--**they have never yet seen the emergence of a new species or even a new enzyme**” (Gordon R. Taylor, *The Great Evolution Mystery*, 1983, p. 48).

7. Breeding involves the reshuffling of genetic information or the loss of genetic information, not the addition of it.

In discussing Gregor Mendel's experiments with peas, Dr. Lowell Coker observes:

“... that which is commonly and erroneously referred to as evolution or microevolution on a population basis does not show change but merely shows an expression of difference that is inherent within the genome. The total number of the alleles does not change, the ratio of dominant to recessive alleles is different resulting in the expression of difference in the phenotype. ... What is

observed is the expression of difference. Information coded within the DNA structure has neither been acquired nor lost. The genetic expression of the DNA structure is variable with the difference being the expression of either the dominant or recessive character, depending on the state of the pair of alleles of a gene” (*Darwin’s Design Dilemma*, p. 105).

Discussing the breeding of dogs, Jonathan Sarfati writes:

“All the breeders do is select from the information already present. For example, Chihuahuas were bred by selecting the smallest dogs to breed from over many generations. But this process eliminates the genes for large size. The opposite process would have bred Great Danes from the same ancestral dog population. So the breeding has sorted out the information mixture into separate lines. All the breeds have less information than the original dog/wolf kind” (*Refuting Evolution*, p. 43).

Breeding experiments have therefore refuted evolution’s proposal that mutations could add the reams of complex genetic information necessary to turn a wolf into a whale or a dinosaur into a bird.

8. Human breeding experiments prove that intelligence is necessary to produce dramatic changes in nature.

“Darwin’s analogy to artificial selection is misleading. Plant and animal breeders employ intelligence and specialized knowledge to select breeding stock and to protect their charges from natural dangers. The point of Darwin’s theory, however, was to establish that purposeless natural processes can substitute for intelligent design. That he made that point by citing accomplishments of intelligent designers proves only that the receptive audience for his theory was highly uncritical” (Phillip Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, p. 18).

The Giraffe's Blood Pressure Control System

The giraffe has an amazing blood pressure control system to facilitate its long neck.

When it is standing with its neck erect, the blood pressure in its arteries is highest in the base of its neck and lowest in its head. The heart is capable of producing the pressure necessary to maintain proper pressure in its brain.

When the giraffe bends its head to the ground, it lowers its head between its front legs. Without a special system, the pressure would burst blood vessels and injure its brain. This doesn't happen because there is a wonderful coordinated system to control the pressure.

“Pressure sensors along the neck's arteries monitor the blood pressure, and can signal activation of other mechanisms to counter any increase in pressure as the giraffe drinks or grazes. Contraction of the artery walls, a shunting of part of the arterial blood flow to bypass the brain, and a web of small blood vessels (the *rete mirabile*, or ‘marvelous net’) between the arteries and the brain all serve to control the blood pressure in the giraffe's head” (Davis and Kenyon, *Of Pandas and People*, p. 71).

This is not just a bunch of different traits; it is “a coordinated system.” And without the entire system in place the giraffe could not survive.

The Bombardier Beetle

The bombardier beetle is an amazing creature that points irrefutably to a Creator. Michael Pitman, who taught evolution at Cambridge, describes this lowly beetle's defense mechanism:

“Under attack it aims two tubes in its tail at the enemy. There is a miniature explosion and fumes are projected which effectively repulse such small predators as ant, spider, frog or praying mantis. The components of the

mechanism include two adjacent storage sacs, combustion chambers, gun-like swivel tubes and, of course, the bombardier's instinct for using them. Chemicals (hydroquinones, hydrogen peroxide and enzymes) are present in the right places, amounts and concentrations. A series of nerve and muscle attachments co-ordinate the system and aim the protective spray. This spray is not continuous. Each discharge, pulsed as a rapidly firing machine-gun, can be heard as a 'pop'. An almost instantaneous reaction takes place in which oxygen blasts out a quinone spray under high pressure. Space rockets work on the same principle. As well as boiling, the beetle's spray is toxic and malodorous!" (*Adam and Evolution*, p. 194).

Biologist Michael Behe describes the complex chemical properties involved in this beetle's defense mechanism:

"Prior to battle, specialized structures called secretory lobes make a very concentrated mixture of two chemicals, hydrogen peroxide and hydroquinone. The hydrogen peroxide is the same material as one can buy in a drugstore; hydroquinone is used in photographic development. The mixture is sent into a storage chamber called the collecting vesicle. The collecting vesicle is connected to, but ordinarily sealed off from, a second compartment called (evocatively) the explosion chamber. The two compartments are kept separate from one another by a duct with a sphincter muscle, much like the sphincter muscles upon which humans depend for continence. Attached to the explosion chamber are a number of small knobs called ectodermal glands; these secrete enzyme catalysts into the explosion chamber. When the beetle feels threatened it squeezes muscles surrounding the storage chamber while simultaneously relaxing the sphincter muscle. This forces the solution of hydrogen peroxide and hydroquinone to enter the explosion chamber where it mixes with the enzyme catalysts. Now chemically, things get interesting. The hydrogen peroxide rapidly decomposes into ordinary

water and oxygen, just as a store-bought bottle of hydrogen peroxide will decompose over time if left open. The oxygen reacts with the hydroquinone to yield more water, plus a highly irritating chemical called quinone. These reactions release a large quantity of heat. The temperature of the solution rises to the boiling point; in fact, a portion vaporizes into steam. The steam and oxygen gas exert a great deal of pressure on the walls of the explosion chamber. With the sphincter muscle now closed, a channel leading outward from the beetle's body provides the only exit for the boiling mixture. Muscles surrounding the channel allow the steam jet to be directed at the source of danger. The end result is that the beetle's enemy is scalded by a steaming solution of toxic chemical quinone" (*Darwin's Black Box*).

The bombardier beetle is one of the things that convinced former dyed-in-the-wool evolutionist Dr. Jobe Martin of the truth of creation. He says:

"I began to think, O.K. how would that evolve? If evolution is true it had to somehow evolve that. Let's assume it is evolving this defense mechanism, but the first time that it finally produces the explosion, what happens to the bug? Well, it is destroyed by the explosion, and we know that splattered bug pieces don't evolve. So I thought, how could this have happened? Well, [because of the intricate way it is built] it doesn't blow itself up. It has another little factory inside itself and it manufactures a chemical that acts as a catalyst, so when it squirts that chemical into these other chemicals that are in a suspended state it produces the explosion. And it has an asbestos-lined firing chamber to protect itself. And it has two little twin tail tubes, and it can aim these tubes out the side, even out the front. Let's say a spider is coming up toward its side and it doesn't have time to turn around and shoot. It can just take its little gun turret, aim it out to the side, and shoot. If you are listening to the explosion all you hear is a single pop, but scientists have now put that sound into slow motion, and it is like about a

thousand sequential little explosions that are so fast that all we hear is one pop. So you think, why would that be? It was a curious thing for the scientists that are studying this little bug. A lot of them are at Cornell University and some other places. What they discovered was that if it were just one big explosion, the little bug would be jetted away by the force! But as long as it is a sequential explosion, the bug with his little legs can hang on. How would evolution explain a sequential explosion? This little bug messes with all of the theories of evolution. There is no way a slow, gradual process is going to produce this bug. There is no way, even, that the newer theories, such as punctuated equilibrium, can explain this bug. I began to realize that this little bug needed to have all of its parts there at once or you just don't have the animal" (Jobe Martin, *Incredible Creatures that Defy Evolution 1*, ExplorationFilms.com).

The Amphibian Egg

The egg is a most amazing thing and exhibits evidence of brilliant Design in a multitude of ways.

Michael Pitman, who taught biology at Cambridge, describes just a few of the marvelous features of the amphibian egg:

"The shell demands delicate compromise. It must be strong enough to resist breakage but fragile enough for the chick to chip free. It must lose the right amount of water so that the embryo neither dries out nor drowns in its own metabolic water. Its size and nutrient content must be geared to embryo size at birth. And gases must be able to diffuse through pores which are the result of deliberately randomized packing of the calcium-carbonate crystals. Such a shell requires two special embryonic membranes--the amnion and allantois--to protect the embryo, allow it to breathe and act as a reservoir for the waste products resulting from metabolism. Waste products must take the form of

insoluble uric acid (produced by birds and reptiles) not the soluble urea produced by amphibians and mammals.

“Fertilization of the egg must occur within the female before the shell begins to harden, necessitating concomitant changes in the urogenital organs and habits of the adult. And the hatchling needs a chipping tool to develop at precisely the right time and place, along with the right instinct to chip out of its cradle.

“Most of these changes would be useless if not harmful until more or less complete. We are required to believe that these factors evolved simultaneously, by chance, with harmonious, interlocking functions ... Without all these arrangements (which are supposed to occur gradually over relatively long periods of time) the creature would die before hatching” (Michael Pitman, *Adam and Evolution*, pp. 199, 200).

The Bird's Flight Feather

Engineer Stuart Burgess says, “A flight feather is a masterpiece of design and is one of the most efficient structures known to man” (*Hallmarks of Design*, p. 38).

Jack Cohen, who is an evolutionist, nevertheless says that the flight feather is “engineered to the utmost precision” and that examining it “is a humbling process” (“Feathers and Pattern,” *Advances in Morphogenesis*, edited by Abercrombie and Bracket, 1966, pp. 9, 12).

A “simple” pigeon feather is composed of more than one million individual parts made up of billions of cells perfectly organized into a marvel of design.

The flight feather has the following three major features (adapted from Burgess, p. 39).

- * a hollow stem containing air or foam, which starts out as a circle near the root of the feather and changes into a rectangular shape which is structurally stronger

* barbs angle off of the stem forming the basic feather shape

* two sets of barbules angle off of the barbs, with one set of barbules having hooks that interlock with a set of non-hooked barbules; there can be hundreds of thousands of barbules in one feather

With the barbules hooked, the wing has a lightweight flat surface that the bird uses to push against the air. The barbules prevent air from passing through the wing on the downward motion while allowing air to pass through on the wing's upward motion.

Michael Pitman, who taught biology at Cambridge, describes the marvelous design of the flight feather:

“Some large feathers contain over a million barbules, with hooks and eye-lets to match, in perfect order. The feather is useless without this interlocking mechanism which acts something like an automatic zip fastener whose disturbance preening rearranges. When outstretched in flight, the hooks cause the whole wing-assembly to form a continuous sheet to catch the wind. The whole feather is a cohesive, elastic and light structure, well-designed to function as an air-resistant surface. Sensory receptors record its precise position. Over both wings they effect the continuous variations and fine adjustments of more than ten thousand tiny muscles attached to the bases of the feathers. Behold the parts of a precious instrument of aerospace, unparalleled in design and workmanship by human technology” (*Adam and Evolution*, p. 222).

Bird Migration

Bird migration is one of the incalculable wonders of creation. The incentive and ability to migrate long distances is obviously built into the creature's genetic code. It cannot be explained by “natural selection” or mutations.

Evolutionists theorize that birds developed migration during the ice age. “[A]s the great ice sheets retreated from

North America, they gradually expanded their ranges to exploit rich temperate food resources and nesting space” (“Migration Basics,” hummingbird.net).

This explains nothing, really. It doesn’t explain *why* the birds would continue to migrate when they could easily stay in one place. It doesn’t explain *how* the birds can navigate thousands of miles across the globe to precise locations, how they developed the complex physiological changes that prepare them for long-distance migrations, how they can achieve the precise timings that allow them to arrive at breeding grounds at just the right time for breeding, etc., how they can survive the harsh conditions through which they often migrate, how the Alaskan Bar-Tailed Godwit can fly 9,000 miles non-stop, how the baby cuckoo can hatch and then fly 12,000 miles to join its parents in a place it has never been, etc.

The ice age “theory” is another “just so” story that is not proven and explains nothing.

The rapid advance in micro-technology and satellite communication since about 2010 has led to a revolution in our knowledge of the migratory habits of birds. Researchers are tagging them with geolocators weighing one-fifth of an ounce that transmit packets of information to satellites.

The bird migration award goes to the **Arctic tern** (*Sterna paradisaea*), which spends the summer in the Arctic rearing its young, then flies the entire length of the earth to the Antarctic for its winter holiday. It makes this trip annually, and with the recent advance in micro-electronics, researchers have been able to learn much more about the migration habits of this amazing bird. Previously, it was thought that the tern traveled about 20,000 miles on its journey, but actually it travels an average of 44,000 miles. Terns that breed in northern Netherlands travel 56,000 miles! Over a lifetime of 30 years, the little 3.5-ounce tern will travel roughly 1.3 MILLION miles. The terns fly from the Greenland Sea in the north Atlantic down the coast of Africa. Before they reach

central Africa, the terns split into two groups, some continuing down the African coast and across the southern Atlantic Ocean to the Antarctic, others flying across the Atlantic from Africa to South America, then proceeding down the coast of South America to the Weddell Sea and the Antarctic. On the return trip north, the terns do not follow the same path. Instead, they fly a “twisted S shaped pattern” across the Atlantic Ocean. Researchers have discovered that though this adds many miles to the trip, “the birds are taking advantage of the global wind system” and “thus actually use less energy thanks to the wind currents” (Savannah Humes, “The 3.5 Ounce Bird,” TodayIFoundOut.com). Do evolutionists really think that birds are this smart? The birds return to the same place and the same colony where they hatched. Though the terns are not sexually mature until three or four years old, the junior birds complete the annual migration nonetheless.

The ability to travel the full length of the globe is so amazingly complex that it requires an Intelligent Designer. “If the Arctic tern uses the stars to navigate, then it must recognize stars in both hemispheres. If the bird uses the earth’s magnetic field, then it must know the difference between the south magnetic pole and the north magnetic pole!” (Stuart Burgess, *Hallmarks of Design*, p. 42).

The **Sooty Shearwater** (*Puffinus griseus*) is a close second in distance migration. It travels up to 40,000 miles, covering 300 miles a day. It travels from the Falkland Islands off the east coast of the tip of South America to the Arctic Ocean.

The **Alaskan Bar-Tailed Godwit** (*Limosa lapponica*) is another super migrator. Unlike the tern and many other migrators, this bird makes its 7,000-mile, nine-day journey NON-STOP, without landing for rest, food, or water. One Bar-Tailed Godwit that was tracked with a satellite tag flew 6,800 miles from Alaska to New Zealand non-stop in an eight-day flight (www.plosbiology.org). “The godwits gorge themselves on shellfish, until the fat builds up into thick rolls

under their skin--up to 55% of their total weight. Then they stop eating and their intestines, kidneys and liver shrivel up to a fraction of their usual size, eliminating unnecessary weight" (Jonathan Sarfati, *By Design*, p. 88).

The distance record holder among song birds is the **Northern Wheatear** (*Oenanthe oenanthe*). This tiny bird, weighing from .5 to 1.2 ounces, flies about 18,000 miles annually, from northern and central Asia, northern Europe, and Greenland to Sub-saharan Africa, crossing ocean, ice, and desert. Tagged Northern Wheatears have flown from Alaska across Siberia, Russia, Turkey, the Arabian Desert, to central Africa.

The **whimbrel** (*Numenius phaeopus*) migrates 3,500 miles non-stop from the Southampton Island in Canada's Arctic to the mouth of the Amazon River in Brazil. One whimbrel that was tagged with a radio transmitter flew through Hurricane Irene when it was a category 3 storm and not only did the bird survive, it was able to make the necessary correction after being blown off course and complete its migration successfully ("Bird Migrates through Hurricane Irene," *USA Today*, August 28, 2011).

The **Bar-headed goose** (*Anser indicus*) probably wins the *extreme* migration award. It migrates from Tibet to India, crossing the Himalayan Mountains to a height of four miles where there is little oxygen, subzero temperatures, and the winds can blow with hurricane fury. A 2011 study tracked the geese flying at 21,000 feet. "Way up in the Himalayas, where thin air and low oxygen pressure hinder speech and movement, weary mountaineers have observed bar-headed geese honking away as they ascend powerfully overhead" (The Most Extreme Migration on Earth?" *Sciencemag.org*, June 7, 2011). Tagged geese have made the journey from India to Tibet in seven or eight hours, flying at 39 MPH (64 KPH). The southbound trip is made in about 4.5 hours. These geese have proportionally bigger lungs and

better supply of oxygen to the muscles and heart than many other birds (Ibid.).

The **Pacific Golden Plover** (*Pluvialis fulva*) migrates from the Arctic tundra in Alaska and northern Canada to Hawaii, Marshall, Fiji, and other South Pacific islands, unerringly finding a tiny island in the middle of the Pacific Ocean after a journey of thousands of miles. Those that migrate from Alaska to Hawaii make the 3,000-mile journey in four to five days, averaging 39 miles per hour. The ground speed of some plovers in migration with strong tailwinds has been tracked at 103 to 114 MPH (167-185 KPH) ("Plovers Tracked across the Ocean," Phys.org, June 13, 2011). Researches using geolocators have found that the birds return to the same location each year. Professor Wally Johnson of Montana State University says, "They're so strongly site-faithful that we can predict where they will be with almost 100 per cent accuracy" (Ibid.).

The **Ruby-throated Hummingbird** (*Archilochus colubris*) migrates from northern North America to southern Mexico. On one part of this journey, some of the tiny birds fly across the Gulf of Mexico (while others fly around the southern part of Texas). The Gulf jumpers fly 450-500 miles in 18-22 hours, often against headwinds of 20 miles per hour and more, beating their tiny wings nearly 3 million times on that amazing journey. Some rest on offshore oil rigs and fishing boats, but others make the journey non-stop. The tiny bird flies from the coast of Yucatan in southern Mexico to Texas and Florida. In preparation for the journey, it gorges itself with insects and spiders, adding a thick layer of fat that nearly doubles its weight to six grams. If a larger bird gained the equivalent of this much weight, it wouldn't be able to fly. The males and females do not migrate at the same time, with the females leaving Mexico about ten days after the males. Once arriving in America, the hummingbird's migration continues north at a rate of about 20 miles per day, as the bird follows the northern spread of spring vegetation. In late spring, the

globe-hopping hummingbird arrives back in the place where it hatched. Some other Ruby-throated hummingbirds migrate from Alaska and cross the desolate Mojave Desert. The birds know how to use the winds to their advantage. “Researchers in the Appalachian Mountains of Pennsylvania found that hummingbirds will migrate in larger numbers when the winds were blowing in the direction they wished to go, and even more so when the winds were strong” (“Hummingbird Migration,” worldofhummingbirds.com).

Cuckoo birds lay their eggs in the nest of another type of bird in England and Europe, then fly 12,000 miles to Africa, crossing the Mediterranean Sea and the Sahara Desert in the process. After the baby cuckoo hatches and is raised by an adopted parent, it flies 12,000 miles to join the parents it has never seen at a place it has never been (Richard Milton, *Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, p. 249). One cuckoo that was tagged with a solar-powered satellite tracking device in 2011 flew 45,000 miles in three years, migrating from England to Angola. The birds usually spend only a few weeks in Africa before heading north again.

The **Manx Shearwater** (*Puffinus puffinus*), a seabird that nests around Great Britain and Ireland, migrates over 6,200 miles *(10,000 kilometers) to South America in winter. One bird that was tagged in 1957 and still breeding on Bardsey Island off Wales in 2002 has been estimated to have flown five million miles (eight million km.) in its lifetime. A Manx Shearwater was taken to Boston, tagged, and released, and in 12 days it returned to its nest off Wales 3,200 miles away (*A Closer Look at the Evidence*, May 6).

The **common swift** (*Apus apus*) migrates at night up, flying at up to 10,000 feet high and sleeping during flight. One tagged common swift flew more than 3,100 miles from Africa to the United Kingdom in five days. It maintained an average of 25 miles per hour. Its round-trip migration totaled 12,400 miles. The swift spends most of its life on the wing, eating, sleeping, and mating in flight. Its Latin name is from the

Greek word *apous*, meaning “without feet,” which refers to the fact that it has short legs that are used only for clinging to vertical surfaces. Johan Backman, who has studied swift flight with radar, says, “We found that swifts have an extraordinary ability to perform orientations in relation to wind. Even the most advanced planes, with good navigational instruments, would probably be unable to judge the wind drift like this. The remarkable thing is that they do all this while flying through the night and sleeping on the wing at these very high altitudes” (“How the Swift Keeps to Its Course,” *Sunday Telegraph*, March 14, 2004, cited from Jonathan Sarfati, *By Design*, p. 91).

Evolution did not produce bird migration. It is another irrefutable evidence for the existence of an Almighty God who loves beauty and variety and who filled the world with wonder for man’s instruction and delight.

“Praise ye the LORD. Praise God in his sanctuary: praise him in the firmament of his power. Praise him for his mighty acts: praise him according to his excellent greatness” (Psalm 150:1-2).

Birdsong

Birdsong is a wonderful icon of creation.

Though all bird sounds are typically categorized as “songs,” a distinction should be made between true songbirds and other birds that make various noises. For example, most ducks, eagles, and hawks are not songbirds. They quack or screech, but they don’t sing.

I suspect that bird calls are often lumped into the “song” category because of the evolutionary philosophy underlying the field. It is assumed that the purpose for all bird noises, regardless of how pretty and complicated, is for such things as territorial marking and mating which supposedly acted as conditions for “natural selection.” Evolutionists even theorize

that the true song birds are more highly evolved (Les Beletsky, *Bird Songs from Around the World*, 2007, p. 7).

While we have no doubt that bird songs mean something to birds, the Bible believer knows there is more to it than this. Evolutionists are blind to the fact that a pretty bird song has a much higher purpose, and that is to glorify the Creator and to please man, the crown of creation (Psalm 8:4-8).

Birds have two sets of membranes in their syrinx (voice box) so that they can produce independent sounds in two voices at once.

“Birds vocalize with the syrinx, a sound-producing organ located at the junction of the two bronchi at the base of the trachea. These two bronchial sides can actually be stimulated independently, so they can each produce different sounds at the same time, as happens in the clear, flutelike song of the Wood Thrush” (*Bird Songs: 250 North American Birds in Song*, foreword by Jon Dunn, p. 6).

Birds can take mini-breaths that are so brief and so perfectly synchronized with their songs they do not produce any discernible gaps in their songs.

“Birds give the impression of singing in long bursts for minutes on end without catching their breath. But they actually do this by taking a series of shallow mini-breaths, which are synchronized with each syllable they sing” (Gareth Davies, “Bird Songs,” pbs.org, n.d., <http://www.pbs.org/lifeofbirds/songs/index.html>, retrieved Oct. 13, 2010).

Some birds have truly amazing musical abilities.

Pliny the Elder said in *Naturalis Historia* “that the song of the Nightingale was equal in beauty to any musical instrument that man could produce” (*Beautiful Bird Songs from Around the World*, British Library, 2008).

Percy Shelley described the Skylark’s song as ‘a rain of melody’ in his poem “To a Skylark.” “Anyone who has stood

beneath an ascending Skylark in full song will immediately appreciate this fitting description” (*Beautiful Songs*).

Many composers have transcribed birdsong.

“Ornithologists have known for some time that bird songs use the same musical scales as our music. Decades ago it was noted that some of Beethoven's work could be heard from the European blackbird. The music was the same as the opening rondo of Beethoven's ‘Violin Concert in D, Opus 61.’ Since these birds pass their songs from generation to generation, Beethoven could have gotten the lilting music from the forefathers of today's European blackbird! The songs of some species, like the song sparrow, follow the form of a sonata, beginning with a strong theme, then the theme is musically played with, and for a finish, the original theme is then repeated. Mozart had a starling as a pet. Once, having heard Mozart play his ‘Piano Concerto in C Major,’ the starling not only imitated it, but changed the sharps to flats! Mozart exclaimed, ‘That was beautiful!’ When the starling died, Mozart held an elaborate funeral for it. Eight days later he wrote ‘A Musical Joke,’ which contains the same elaborate structure found in starling song” (*Creation Moments*, May 12, 2010, citing “Music without Borders,” *Science News*, April 15, 2000, pp. 252-254).

“French composer Olivier Messiaen (1908-1992) ... dedicated much of his career to studying and expressing the musicality of birdsong. One of his most famous and ambitious pieces is the *Catalogue d'oiseaux*, a seven-book set of portraits that captures the spirit of species such as the Woodlark, Reed Warbler and Blue Rock Thrush” (*Beautiful Songs*).

The nightingale has a repertoire of 100-300 songs.

A chaffinch can sing up to 45 notes per second and there can be several hundred notes per song (Stuart Burgess, *Hallmarks of Design*).

Some birds **transpose songs** from one key to another.

Others sing the same song in a **variety of voices**.

Some birds sing **DUETS**. These include the Australian magpie, Eastern whipbird, African shrike, African robin-chat, passerine, plain-tailed wren of Ecuador, California towhee, Long-tailed manakins, Buff-breasted wren, Rufous-and-white wren (*Thryothorus rufalbus*), Panama bay wren, Marsh wren, and the African shrike.

Some birds engage in **countersinging and antiphonal singing**, with one bird singing part of a song and the other bird singing another part, moving back and forth, possibly spontaneously composing “variations on a theme.”

Some pairs of songbirds, such as the African shrike, African robin-chat, and Eastern whipbird (of Australia) perform this type of singing.

Antiphonal singing requires knowledge of the duet by both partners and split-second timing in its execution.

The whip-crack sound made by the male Eastern whipbird is actually a very rapidly ascending or descending whistle. Amazingly, the whistle stretches from 500 to 8000 Hz in just 0.1 seconds. The female often adds two notes to the end of the male's whistle.

Some birds even sing **MATCHED DUETTING** in a group of four.

“The two pairs of courting birds will deliberately compose a song with four parts over a period of time. The songs are often very beautiful, with great musical structure, and involve split-second timing of the four participants.”

Matched duetting was discovered by a team of researchers in 2002 among the plain-tailed wrens (*Thryothorus*) in Ecuador.

As the morning mists rose on the slopes of Ecuador's Pasochoa volcano, the burbling of plain-tailed wrens came through the bamboo thickets. Two researchers started their standard procedure of catching wrens, banding them, and letting them go. Soon, however, they were startled when a small cluster of wrens settled into a bush and began singing together. It turned out to be ‘one

of the most complex singing performances yet described in a nonhuman animal,' says Nigel Mann.

"This social oddity has musical consequences. Often, three or more birds sing—males, then females, then males, and so on—to produce what sounds like a single melody.

'It's quite difficult to work out what's Charlie's contribution, what's Mary's,' Mann says. Yet the scientists did work out the score. At rare moments in the several weeks of observation, Mann or Dingess picked up clues to which bird was singing when one singer perched closer to the microphone than the rest of the chorus did.

From these hard-won moments, the researchers realized that songs typically repeat four phrases: ABCDABCD.... Only males sing the As and Cs, and only females sing Bs and Ds. Each singer knows 25-to-30 variations on each of its two possible parts, and for each variation of A, a particular variation of B usually follows, as do particular Ds after Cs.

When more than two birds strike up a tune, they double up on the parts so precisely that if one bird stops singing, the tune keeps going. The males sing the same variation of A with precise timing, followed by the females chorusing the same version of B, then back to the males for the same C, and so on. The parts shift back and forth at least twice a second.

It's the first four-part, synchronized chorus with alternating parts recorded outside human music, Mann, Dingess, and Peter J.B. Slater of the University of St. Andrews in Scotland report in the March 22 *Biology Letters*. And when one considers the split-second alternation, the birds' singing surpasses human vocal virtuosity (Susan Milius, "Just Duet," BioMusica.blogia.com, 2002).

"The white-crested laughing thrush also sings a group chorus. Each individual has its own phrase to contribute

to the song; the result is like one bird singing. White-browed sparrow weavers sing group choruses, which they use to defend their territories. Remarkably, each bird is an expert sound mixer. It can also produce the whole chorus on its own. The sound produced by one individual will sound as complex as that produced by nine” (Gareth Davies, “Bird Songs,” <http://www.pbs.org/lifeofbirds/songs/index.html>, retrieved Oct. 13, 2010).

(The idea proposed in the previous report that the weavers are using the choruses to defend their territories is speculation based on evolutionary assumptions that bird song evolved through natural selection.)

Some birds are adept at mimicking other birds.

A mockingbird was recorded in Arizona singing a series of different songs for 90 seconds without repeating any one song.

A Crissal Thrasher was recorded in Arizona imitating the following birds in one session: Killdeer, Red-tailed Hawk, Western/Cassin's Kingbird, Lesser Goldfinch, Mockingbird, Plain Titmouse, Flicker, House Sparrow, American Robin, Sparrow Hawk, Abert's Towhee, and Song Sparrow.

Some birds can even recreate other non-bird sounds in nature and man-made noises. Starlings in the Shetland Islands can mimic sheep. The Australian lyrebird, the king of feathered mimics, can imitate such things as the whirring of a camera's motor drive and shutter, car engines and alarms, rifle-shots, explosions, a baby's cry, a dog's bark, and the screech of a chainsaw. There is a sound clip online of Chook, a lyrebird at the Adelaide Zoo, imitating construction equipment (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WeQjkQpeJwY>). See also http://www.bbc.co.uk/nature/life/Superb_Lyrebird.

These amazing feats require not only a wonderfully-designed voice box but also marvelous intelligence, not only to control the voice apparatus but also to identify and recall sounds.

The Hummingbird

The 300 species of hummingbirds vary in size from the giant hummingbird, with a length of about eight inches (20 cm.), to the bee hummingbird, with a length of about two inches (5 cm.).

The hummingbird can swivel its wings through an amazing degree of angles. The wings beat a figure eight pattern which allows it to hover and fly backwards (by moving the wings in a circular path over its head), sideways, and even upside down.

It can beat its wings up to 200 cycles per second and reach speeds of 50 miles per hour.

The wing muscles necessary to drive this flight system represent up to 40% of the bird's total body weight.

Its long, thin beak is designed to feed on the nectar of flowers; its tongue has two furrows that it uses to store the nectar. The tongue can go in and out at a rate of 13 times per second, and is stored by being curled up at the back of the bird's head. Its tongue is also fringed so it can sweep insects from inside flowers. "It cannot survive on nectar alone, but also needs protein from eating insects. Without its special tongue it could never catch these" (*A Closer Look at the Evidence*, July 14).

One type of hummingbird is the fastest diving bird on earth.

"A peregrine falcon diving toward its prey reaches a relative speed of 200 body-lengths per second. This is close to the 207 body-lengths that the space shuttle travels as it enters our atmosphere. Thus, the peregrine falcon was thought to easily be the fastest dare-devil bird on Earth. Scientists have now discovered that a little pink male hummingbird called Anna's Hummingbird is the real Top Gun among the birds. As part of its mating ritual, a male hummingbird will try to impress a female with his speed and acrobatics. First, the male will fly up to

about 90 feet above the ground. Then, he begins a power dive. As he nears the female, he pulls up, ascending again. During that near-miss pull-up he experiences more than nine times the force of gravity. His relative speed during descent is 385 body-lengths per second. That's almost twice the peregrine falcon's relative speed, it's faster than the space shuttle entering the Earth's atmosphere and is more than twice the relative speed of a jet fighter running with afterburners" (<http://www.creationmoments.com/radio/transcript.php?t=2889>).

One type of hummingbird can fly 500 miles nonstop over the Gulf of Mexico.

"The hummingbird is so different from other types of bird that it is impossible for the evolutionist to hypothesize that it could fit onto any evolutionary tree" (Stuart Burgess, *Hallmarks of Design*, p. 137).

Red Blood Cells

The human red blood cell (*erythrocyte*) is perfectly designed to carry oxygen throughout the body. Even evolutionary writings use terms such as "highly specialized" and "nature's design" to describe these amazing things.

The blood cells flow in plasma through the body's breathtakingly complex circulatory system, which is used to maintain the body's temperature, regulate the body's pH balance, provide communication, transport oxygen, nutrients, hormones, clotting agents, and immune defense mechanisms such as antibodies, white blood cells, and platelets, and remove waste. Blood flows everywhere in the body, from the roots of the hair to the toes.

The red blood cells are formed in the marrow of the ribs, pelvis, and some other bones. They are 1/25,000 of an inch in size. There are about 25 trillion of them in the body, and they live only 100-120 days. They must be replaced because they are unable to synthesize new enzymes to replace those lost

during normal cell metabolic process due to their lack of organelles (<http://www.fortunecity.com/greenfield/rattler/46/blood2.htm>). The body replaces the blood cells at the rate of about 2.5 million per second, but that rate can be increased if the body needs more blood cells due to heavy bleeding or a reduction in oxygen content of the air at high altitude.

The main function of the red blood cell is to carry oxygen throughout the human body, and it is perfectly designed for this. First of all, its shape, which is biconcave and looks similar to a donut, allows more surface area to facilitate absorption and diffusion of oxygen. The shape of the red blood cell also allows it to contort through minute blood capillaries that are smaller in diameter than itself, and it can spring back to its original shape. Further, it can carry more hemoglobin molecules because it loses its nucleus, and its internal organelles (cell organs) are degraded soon after it is made, and it thus has more storage capacity than other types of cells in the body. Each red blood cell carries about 300 million hemoglobin molecules.

The hemoglobin (or haemoglobin) molecule that is carried within the red blood cell (and that gives the bright red color) is a miracle of design in its own right. It is an iron-containing protein that allows oxygen to be picked up from the lungs and carried through the fluid of the circulatory system. The hemoglobin molecule has a single atom of iron at its center, and in the lungs this iron atom combines with oxygen to create a compound called oxyhemoglobin. Oxygen by itself is not very soluble in water, but the hemoglobin molecule binds four oxygen molecules to itself, “consequently hemoglobin permits human blood to carry more than 70 times the amount of oxygen that it could have carried otherwise” (<http://help.com/post/202779-are-there-any-parts-inside-a-red-bl>).

After the hemoglobin transports its oxygen to cells in the body, it reinvents itself as a waste disposal entity; combining

with the carbon dioxide given off by the cells as waste it carries this back to the lungs.

The processes that take place in the blood are extremely complicated and interrelated at the most fundamental level. Everything from the individual atoms up must work together in perfect harmony for the individual to survive. And the blood is only one part of the circulatory system that, in turn, is intimately interrelated with the other systems of the body. Even something as simple as a change in the shape of the red blood cell is a threat to survival.

A system this complicated screams out “divine creation.”

Further, nearly three and a half millennia ago the Bible said “the life of the flesh is in the blood” (Lev. 17:11). Only in these most modern of times have we learned how scientifically accurate that statement was!

Lima Bean Distress Signal

When the lima bean plant is attacked by spider mites, it creates and emits a mixture of chemicals that contain at least three different signals.

“This new signal has a slightly different odor from that of an unstressed plant, and it carries several messages, each for a different recipient. It has a message for nearby lima bean plants that are not under attack. When the signal reaches them, these plants apparently also begin to send out the distress signal, even though they themselves are free of mites. The distress signal also reaches distant spider mites, but instead of attracting these mites, as the odor of an unstressed bean plant did, this new odor now repels them. Finally, the third recipient of the new signal is the carnivorous mites, which are recruited to devour the spider mites” (William Agosta, *Bombardier Beetles and Fever Trees*, pp. 28, 29).

How can evolution explain this? How can a dumb bean plant create complex chemical mixtures that signal messages

to animals and other plants? What does a bean plant know about spider mites and how to signal them? How would natural selection explain this? Even if the plant were to accidentally “mutate” a chemical compound that would act as a distress signal, how would it know that it had created such a compound or know when and how to use it? And natural selection is “blind,” so it wouldn’t know such things.

The Variety Of Life

The mind-boggling variety of life is an icon of creation.

There are thousands of ways that plants pollinate; thousands of ways that they disperse their seeds; thousands of types of seeing and hearing structures; thousands of ways to creep, crawl, walk, and fly; thousands of types of eggs and of ways of laying, fertilizing, and hatching them; thousands of types of fins; thousands of types of hearts and lungs and brains and wings, each perfectly capable of performing whatever task it performs in each particular creature.

And this bewildering variety of processes and structures is repeated at the cellular level. There are thousands of types of proteins and organelles and enzymes, etc.

This variety of staggeringly complex living systems and creatures witnesses to divine Creation rather than to some blind evolutionary process.

Harmony And Symbiosis

According to the Bible, God created the world as a delightful place for man’s existence, but it was plunged into death and chaos because of man’s sin. Thus we would expect to find two seemingly contradictory things in nature: harmony and chaos, delight and pain, glorious life and terrible death, and this is exactly what we find.

The examples of the harmony and integration of nature are endless. Henry Zuill, Ph.D. in biology, observes:

“When we look broadly at the panorama of life and ecological relationships, we see that ecological complexity is built on layer upon layer of complexity, going all the way down through different hierarchical structural and organizational levels to the cell and even lower. ... we are talking about an essential multi-species integrated service system--an entire integrated system. There seems to be no adequate evolutionary way to explain this. How could multiple organisms have once lived independently of services they now require?” (*In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, p. 67-69).

The Finely-Tuned Universe

Charles Townes, Ph.D. in physics from the California Institute of Technology; Nobel Prize in Physics 1964; professor at Columbia University, MIT, and the University of California, Berkeley, observes:

“Intelligent design, as one sees it from a scientific point of view, seems to be quite real. This is a very special universe: it's remarkable that it came out just this way. If the laws of physics weren't just the way they are, we couldn't be here at all. The sun couldn't be there, the laws of gravity and nuclear laws and magnetic theory, quantum mechanics, and so on have to be just the way they are for us to be here” (Charles Townes, “Explore as Much as We Can,” *UCBerkeley News*, June 17, 2005).

That the universe appears to be perfectly designed for life has been observed by many non-creationists.

Astronomer Paul Davies is an evolutionist but he recognizes that evolution cannot explain why the world appears designed for life and how man, with his great intellect, came to live in it. He states the problem as follows:

“On the face of it, the universe does look as if it has been designed by an intelligent creator expressly for the purpose of spawning sentient beings. Like the porridge in the tale of Goldilocks and the three bears, the universe

seems to be 'just right' for life, in many intriguing ways" (*The Goldilocks Enigma*, pp. 3, 5).

The universe runs on precise and beautiful laws that can be described in mathematical formulas. Galileo said, "The great book of nature can be read only by those who know the language in which it was written; and this language is mathematics." Astronomer James Jeans said, "The universe appears to have been designed by a pure mathematician."

"More than 50 physical constants govern the operation of the universe, including Boltzman's constant, Planck's constant, gravitational constant, the pion rest mass, neutron rest mass, electron rest mass, unit charge, mass-energy relation, the gravitational, weak interaction, electromagnetic and strong interaction fine constants. Each of these physical constants must be precisely what they are or the universe (and life) could not exist. They cannot be a minute fraction less or more" (Dr. Duane Gish, *Persuaded by the Evidence*, p. 244).

The earth is a perfect distance from the sun, and the moon is a perfect distance from the earth.

"If it were only 50,000 miles closer, our ocean tides would cover almost all of the landmasses by 35-50 feet, twice a day" (Joe White, *Darwin's Demise*, p. 125).

The Earth's Ecosystem

The earth is a finely-tuned environment for sustaining life.

There is the food chain, with its producers (plants), consumers (animals), and decomposers (micro-organisms).

There is the oxygen/carbon cycle. Plants take in carbon dioxide and expel oxygen, while animals take in oxygen and expel carbon dioxide. This highly complex, perfectly balanced mechanism involves countless plants and animals and humans.

"Imagine a factory capable of converting nothing but dirt, air, water, and sunshine into millions of different useful and/or edible products! As it turns out, the invention has

already happened. These factories not only produce edible goods, but textile fibers, lumber, rubber, oils, and innumerable derivative products from the basic raw materials of dirt, air, water, and sunshine. It all happens continuously in the most efficient manufacturing system imaginable: plants. In addition to providing almost every imaginable necessity for life, plants also allow us to breathe” (*A Closer Look at the Evidence*, September 25).

There is the water cycle, which is composed of vaporization, buoyancy, condensation, precipitation, soil permeation, and distribution. “Here we see a wonderfully complete water cycle which includes the distribution of clean water throughout the land and the drainage of dirty water away from the land” (Stuart Burgess, *Hallmarks of Design*, p. 55).

There is the nitrogen cycle.

“When plants and animals die and decay, or when animals excrete, a substance called ammonia is produced. This substance contains nitrogen but not in the right form for plants. However, the metabolic activities (i.e. the living processes) of bacteria convert the ammonia into nitrites and then nitrates that are suitable for plants” (Burgess, p. 54).

There is air, which has many wonderful properties. It carries the right amount of oxygen necessary for respiration; it carries carbon dioxide for the photosynthesis process in plants; it is a radiation screen; it is a medium for color, unlike the moon with its black sky, because the air molecules scatter shorter wavelength blue light from the white light spectrum of sunlight; it is a medium for sound; it is a medium for vision because it is colorless; it is a medium for smell, because it is odorless; it is a medium for thermal insulation; it is a medium for pressure (astronauts’ faces become puffy because of the lack of air pressure); it facilitates evaporation and drying; it has the right density to support many important

processes such as transporting dust particles that form rain droplets (Burgess, pp. 57, 58).

There is water. It is a liquid at room temperature; it is transparent and odorless; it is a universal solvent; it expands before freezing so that it does not sink to the bottom of a body of water and thus kill the fish.

“Like other materials, water shrinks as it decreases in temperature. However, when the temperature drops to about 4 degrees Celsius, the shrinking stops and any further reductions in temperature towards freezing cause an expansion of the water. This expansion has the effect of making ice less dense than liquid water. The lower density of ice means that it floats on the surfaces of lakes and seas and insulates the warmer water below. ... The fact that water expands on freezing is another mystery to scientists” (Burgess, p. 56)

There is perfect **harmony and symbiosis in the eleven major systems of the human body** (e.g., circulatory, respiratory, immune, nervous, skeletal, muscular). At the cellular level, each cell of the body performs a different task, interrelated with every other cell, contributing to the life function and survival of the whole individual.

There is **symbiosis between the human being and intestinal bacteria** which are necessary for human life.

“Biologists refer to this cooperation between *E. coli* and the colon as mutualism, a relationship where both species benefit from living together. ... the intestinal bacteria contribute to the general well-being of both microbes and people by synthesizing a number of the vitamins essential for good nutrition and breaking down various macronutrients. The human body cannot synthesize niacin to make nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide (NAD) which is necessary for energy conversion in the cell’s mitochondria. Bacteria in significant amounts in the colon form vitamin K, niacin, NAD, and B-complex vitamins” (Alan Gillen, *Body by Design*, p. 57).

There is **symbiosis between termite and microscopic protozoa** that live in its intestinal tract and enable it to digest wood. “The microscopic parasites eat the cellulose wood structure but share enough nutrients to keep their termite host alive. In order to confirm the relationship between the termites and their protozoa, scientists exposed termites to conditions that killed the protozoa but not the host termites. Everything seemed normal and the termites continued to eat wood until they dropped dead 10 to 20 days later. Both the termites and these specific protozoa within the termites survive because of a mutually beneficial relationship. Neither can live without the other” (*A Closer Look*, September 16).

There is an amazing **symbiosis in a type of jellyfish that form colonies called *siphonophores***, which can be up to 40 feet long. Some act as mouths, some as stomachs; some take care of the swimming, while others cast out their tentacles to gather food. “When joined, they act as one huge single creature” (*A Closer Look at the Evidence*, April 2).

There is **symbiosis between several kinds of shrimp and tiny fish and large predatory fish**. The small creatures clean the teeth and mouths of the large fish.

Ant-caterpillar Symbiosis

“The female *Maculinea arion* lays eggs one at a time on the buds of the wild thyme plant. In the fall, the caterpillar hatches and feeds on the thyme for about three weeks. Then it leaves the plant, never to eat vegetation again. On the ground the caterpillar finds a red ant whose colony is near the thyme plant. The ant strokes the caterpillar with its antennae, and the caterpillar gives off sweet milk from the tenth segment of its body. The ant drinks this for about an hour until the caterpillar suddenly hunches up. The ant then puts one leg on each side of the tiny caterpillar, picks it up in its jaws, and carries it back to its nest. Once in the nest, the ants enjoy drinking the caterpillar’s milk while the caterpillar enjoys eating the baby ants! The following June, while still in the

ant nest, the caterpillar comes out of its pupa state as an adult butterfly. It squeezes through small passages to escape to the surface of the ground, where it flies away to start the same life cycle again. Tremendous faith is required to believe that evolution caused this complex and incredible butterfly life cycle with its interdependence between different forms of life” (*A Closer Look*, November 23).

Beetle-bee Symbiosis

“Blister beetles of California's Mojave Desert depend on solitary bees for their life cycle. However, the beetles have nothing of interest to offer the bees. Blister beetle larvae are so tiny that dozens of them can infest the solitary bee's body. Riding on the female bee, they transfer into the solitary bee's nursery when the female lays her eggs. There the beetle larvae eat the pollen that the mother has packed there for her hatchlings. Once they pupate into wingless adults, they then need a male bee to carry them to a female so the next cycle of life can begin. To attract a male bee, large numbers of the beetles pile together into a clump that looks like a female bee. They will hold this shape for up to two weeks, waiting for a male bee to show interest. Researchers have also concluded that while in this position the beetles also generate the scent of a female bee ready to mate! Once a male bee gets close enough, the tiny beetles jump on his body. When he mates with a female, the beetles transfer to her body and wait for her to lay eggs. Scientists are amazed that the beetles, which are not social insects, are smart enough to work together to fool the male bees. Obviously, the beetles did not design this clever strategy by themselves. The cooperation they show for their survival was designed and programmed into them by their wise Creator, perhaps to show us how important working together is for survival” (*Creation Moments*, July 10, 2010).

Tree-ant Symbiosis

The swollen-thorn acacia tree and the acacia ants are dependent on one another for existence. The ants living in a particular tree form a single colony that may number 30,000. They occupy the hollow bases of the tree's thorns. From the tree, the ant receives food (in the form of a special sweet nectar and the small leaves that the tree produces year round). In return, the tree is protected from herbivores. The ants attack any other insects that try to feed on the tree and even attack foraging mammals. The ants even eliminate the leaves of foreign plants that are close enough to touch the tree's foliage. "These advantages are not merely desirable consequences; they are absolute necessities. Daniel H. Janzen, then working at the University of Kansas, found that neither acacia ants nor swollen-thorn acacias can survive outside their interdependent relationship" (William Agosta, *Bombardier Beetles and Fever Trees*, p. 33).

Fish-bacteria Symbiosis

The flashlight fish depends on colonies of luminescent bacteria that pack its light organs. The bacteria, of course, are complex microscopic creatures in their own right. "The fishes furnish the bacteria with food and a stable environment, and the bacteria obligingly serve as the fishes' flashlights" (William Agosta, *Bombardier Beetles and Fever Trees*, p. 127). The fish's two light organs are located beneath its eyes. Though the bacteria glow continuously, the fish controls the light by means of eyelid-like shutters. It uses the light to see its prey. Laboratory tests proved that the fish couldn't locate its prey in a dark tank without its lights. It also uses its lights to communicate with other flashlight fish by means of signals. It also escapes harm by a "blink-and-run" swimming pattern. It swims with its light on establishing a swimming direction in the mind of an observer, then it blinks the light and at the same time abruptly changes direction, blinking the light again when it is in a different location, and

repeating this behavior. It is confusing to a predator and makes the fish difficult to track.

Fungi-plant Symbiosis

“As many as 90 percent of plant species interact with either generalized fungi that can service a variety of plants, or with others that are highly selective in the plants with which they interact. Regardless, these fungi enable plants to obtain nutrients that would otherwise not be sufficiently available. Plants in turn provide carbohydrates for their fungi” (Dr. Henry Zuill, *In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, p. 64).

The fungus *Armillaria* can cover 38 acres and weigh many tons. It is essential for forest ecology, decomposing dead wood, releasing nutrients needed for plants and trees, and producing carbon dioxide which plants use to produce oxygen for humans.

Shrimp-goby Symbiosis

The snapping shrimp and a fish called the goby have an amazing symbiotic relationship. “The snapping shrimp has very poor eyesight, while the goby has excellent eyesight. Both share the same burrow, which is dug by the shrimp and guarded by the goby. The shrimp uses the goby as a blind person uses a Seeing Eye dog. Whenever the shrimp is outside its burrow, it always keeps one antenna on the goby. The shrimp stays hidden inside the burrow if the goby should temporarily swim away. When danger approaches, the goby signals and disappears inside the burrow. The shrimp is right behind him. Neither the goby nor the shrimp can survive without each other, so pairs are established for life when both goby and shrimp are very young. In order for this system to work, both goby and shrimp reproductive systems, which differ greatly, are synchronized so that shrimp and goby youngsters are ready to pair at the same time. The goby relies on the safety of the complex tunnel system the shrimp digs. The shrimp is well designed for digging. Once a tunnel is started, the shrimp can dig a burrow large enough for both

itself and the goby within a few hours. Each of its five pairs of legs is specialized. The first pair of claws is designed for carrying sediment out of the burrow. The second pair of legs is designed to probe for and clean objects as well as scratching sediment from walls. Pairs three, four and five are walking legs that also work well for scratching material from tunnel walls. On its abdomen, the shrimp has several appendages that allow it to move rapidly to protection. Other appendages can create water currents that shift sand back from the digging site. The snapping shrimp, which is less than two inches long, can dig a system of tunnels covering several square feet within a few days. The burrow will have several entrances, as much as four feet apart. All lead to a chamber at the deepest point of the system” (“Seeing Eye Fish” and “Digging Is A Snap,” *Creation Moments*, June 23 and June 24, 2011; from Y. Yanagisawa, “Strange Seabed Fellows,” *Natural History*, August 1990, p. 46).

Pollination

The pollination system is a finely-tuned symbiotic process that involves countless different types of flowers, insects, and birds, all perfectly integrated to maintain life.

The yucca plant depends on the yucca moth for fertilization, and the moth’s larva depend on that particular plant for food.

The voodoo lily raises its temperature by 25 degrees and releases a scent that smells like rotting meat to attract a certain beetle. As it crawls around inside the flower looking for food, it is covered with pollen, which it spreads from flower to flower.

Consider the orchid.

“In many cases the development is such that the flower and insect fit each other like glove and hand. In some cases the device is so ingenious that the bee or other insect is attracted by the fragrance and nectar into a chamber from which there is only one way of escape, and

in escaping the insect must first touch the stigma and then the stamen, and as it passes to the next flower it carries the pollen to the next stigma. But the devices are almost endless. There are over seven thousand different species known..." (Robert Broom, *The Coming of Man: Was It Accident or Design?*).

Bucket orchids, for example, attract two kinds of bees that are drawn to its liquid because it attracts female bees for mating. Since the surface of the orchid is slimy, the bee slips into a tunnel that collapses, trapping the bee and attaching pollen sacs to it, before releasing it. The same bee falls into the same trap in a second orchid, but instead of attaching more pollen sacs, this orchid unhooks the sacs, thus completing the pollination process (Geoff Chapman, "Orchids ... a Witness to the Creator," *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Dec. 1996-Feb. 1997).

Blind evolution had to "create" each one of these amazing devices and not only that, had to "create" the perfect interrelatedness between the plant and pollinating insect. How did this happen when there was no designer, when the flower was incapable of studying the insect and the insect was incapable of studying the flower, yet each is dependent upon the other for survival and each is perfectly fitted for its role in the intricate process?

Sexual Reproduction

The following is from *In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood* by Dr. Walt Brown (pages 19, 78).

If sexual reproduction in plants, animals, and humans is a result of evolutionary sequences, an unbelievable series of chance events must have occurred at each stage:

1. The amazingly complex, radically different, yet complementary reproductive systems of the male and female must have completely and independently evolved

at each stage at about the same time and place. Just a slight incompleteness in only one of the two would make both reproductive systems useless, and the organism would become extinct.

2. The physical, chemical, intellectual, and emotional systems of the male and female would also need to be compatible.

3. The millions of complex products of a male reproductive system (pollen or sperm) must have an affinity for and a mechanical, chemical, and electrical compatibility with the eggs of the female reproductive system.

4. The many intricate processes occurring at the molecular level inside the fertilized egg would have to work with fantastic precision--processes that scientists can describe only in a general sense.

5 The environment of this fertilized egg, from conception through adulthood and until it also reproduced with another sexually capable adult (who also 'accidentally' evolved), would have to be tightly controlled.

6. This remarkable string of 'accidents' must have been repeated for millions of species.

In humans and in all mammals, a mother's immune system, contrary to its normal function, must learn not to attack her unborn baby--half of whom is a 'foreign body' from the father.

Evolutionists admit that they don't know how sexual reproduction evolved.

"The evolution of sex is one of the major unsolved problems of biology. Even those with enough hubris to publish on the topic often freely admit that they have little idea of how sex originated or is maintained. It is enough to give heart to creationists" (Michael Rose, "Slap and Tickle in the Primeval Soup," *New Scientist*, Vol. 112, Oct. 30, 1986, p. 55).

“Sex is something of an embarrassment to evolutionary biologists. Textbooks understandably skirt the issue, keeping it a closely guarded secret” (Kathleen McAuliffe, “Why We Have Sex,” *Omni*, Dec. 1983, p. 18).

Living Technology

In the late 18th century, William Paley used a watch as an illustration of the design concept. If you are walking through a forest and see a watch lying on the ground, you assume immediately that it had an intelligent designer. Likewise, when we see the complexity of living creatures, we must assume the existence of an intelligent designer. Skeptics have tried to silence Paley’s argument with the claim that there is not a direct colliery between a watch and a living organism, since but since then science has uncovered the brilliant living technology that is evident throughout life, even at the cellular level. They have found living machines!

Walt Brown, Ph.D. in mechanical engineering from MIT, observes:

“Most complex phenomena known to science are found in living systems--including those involving electrical, acoustical, mechanical, chemical, and optical phenomena. Detailed studies of various animals also have revealed certain physical equipment and capabilities that the world’s best designers, using the most sophisticated technologies, cannot duplicate. Examples of these designs include molecular-size motors in most living organisms; advanced technologies in cells; miniature and reliable sonar systems of dolphins, porpoises, and whales; frequency-modulated ‘radar’ and discrimination systems of bats; efficient aerodynamic capabilities of hummingbirds; control systems, internal ballistics, and the combustion chambers of bombardier beetles; precise and redundant navigational systems of many birds, fish, and insects; and especially the self-repair capabilities of almost all forms of life. No component of these complex

systems could have evolved without placing the organism at a selective disadvantage until the component's evolution was complete. All evidence points to intelligent design.

“Many bacteria, such as *Salmonella*, *Escherichia coli*, and some *Streptococci*, propel themselves with miniature motors ... Evolutionary theory teaches that bacteria were one of the first forms of life to evolve, and, therefore, they are simple. While bacteria are small, they are not simple. They can even communicate among themselves using chemicals.

“Some plants have motors that are one-fifth the size of bacterial motors.

“Increasing worldwide interest in nano-technology is showing that living things are remarkably designed--beyond anything Darwin could have imagined” (*In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood*, p. 19).

The Flagellum Motor

This microscopic motor-driven propeller propels the sperm cell and certain bacteria. Molecular scientists continue to be amazed at its “apparent” design. Harvard biologist Howard Berg calls it “the most efficient machine in the universe.”

The flagellum motor is composed of a propeller, drive shaft, stator, bushing, u-joint, and is powered by the flow of hydrogen ions.

It can rotate at 6,000 to 17,000 rpm but usually operates at 200 to 1000 rpm.

It can change speeds and reverse direction in a quarter of a turn.

Using this amazing biological motor, the bacteria can propel itself at speeds up to 15 cell lengths per second, which is equivalent to a car traveling 150 miles per hour.

Each shaft rotates a bundle of whiplike flagella that acts as a propeller. Scientists working with ultra-micro devices have learned that the flagella's whiplike propeller, which at first glance looks awkward and inefficient, is actually perfectly right for propelling a very tiny object through a liquid environment. (See "Making Stuff: Smaller," NOVA, PBS, 2011.)

"The bacteria can stop, start, and change speed, direction, and even the 'propeller's' shape. They also have intricate sensors, switches, control mechanisms, and a short-term memory" (Brown, *In the Beginning*, p. 19).

Eight million of the bacterial motors could fit inside the circular cross section of a human hair.

Six thousand years of observation at every level of human existence tells us that even the simplest motor cannot create itself. It is always the product of intelligence, and the more complicated the motor the greater the intelligence necessary to design and build it. The flagellum motor is far more complicated than anything man has built. Common sense unrestrained from naturalistic bias forces the conclusion that this is the product of a very high Intelligence.

Some evolutionists have argued that the flagellum motor could have been "co-opted" from other things. Consider, for example, the following statement:

"The sophisticated components of this flagellum all have precedents elsewhere in nature. In fact, the entire flagellum assembly is extremely similar to an organelle that *Yersinia pestis*, the bubonic plague bacterium, uses to inject toxins into cells. ... The key is that the flagellum's component structures ... can serve multiple functions that would have helped favor their evolution" (J. Rennie, "Answers to Creationist Nonsense," *Scientific American*, 2002, cited from Jonathan Sarfati, *By Design*, p. 137).

The simple reply to this is as follows:

(1) To say that the flagellum "could have" been co-opted from parts from other things in nature is a mere "just-so"

story with no evidence supporting it. It is an argument built not on scientific fact but on evolutionary assumption and wishful thinking.

(2) Most of the flagellum motor's components are *not* found elsewhere in nature and could not therefore have been "co-opted."

(3) The existence of "parts" found somewhere in nature does not answer the issue of how these were formed in the first place or how they could be combined into a complex working motor. Do dumb bacteria know how to build things? Mutations and natural selection have never been known to create new structures. As Phillip Johnson says:

"... natural selection doesn't know a thing about bacterial flagella. ... natural selection can only select for preexisting function. ... for co-option to result in a structure like the bacterial flagellum, we are not talking about enhancing the function of an existing structure or reassigning an existing structure to a different function. Rather, we are talking about reassigning multiple structures previously targeted for different functions to a novel structure exhibiting a novel function" (*Darwin on Trial*, pp. 276, 277).

(4) The incredibly complex instructions for building the flagellum motor are in the bacteria's DNA. Evolution has never explained scientifically how this information got there.

Dr. Jonathan Sarfati answers this challenge as follows:

"*Scientific American's* argument, which comes from Kenneth Miller, and has been parroted by Richard Dawkins, is like claiming that if the components of an electric motor already exist in an electrical shop, they could assemble by themselves into a working motor. However, the right organization is just as important as the right components. Scott Minnich of the University of Idaho, a world expert on the flagellar motor, disagrees with *Scientific American* and Miller (Minnich points out that Miller, unlike him, has no experience in the area). He

says that his belief that this motor has been intelligently designed has given him many research insights. Minnich points out that the very process of assembly in the right sequence requires other regulatory machines. He also points out that only about 10 of the 40 components can possibly be explained by co-option, but the other 30 are brand new” (Sarfati, *By Design*, pp. 137, 138).

In her zeal to refute the design argument inherent in the complexity of the flagellum motor, one evolutionist has even invoked magic.

“Over at BioLogos, biologist Kathryn Applegate has offered what has to be one of the more creative alternatives to the intelligent design of the bacterial flagellum: Magic. [“Self-Assembly of the Bacterial Flagellum: No Intelligence Required,” *The Biologos Forum*, Aug. 19, 2010] I’m not kidding. Applegate readily concedes biochemist Michael Behe’s point that the flagellum ‘looks and functions just like the outboard motor, a machine designed by intelligent human engineers. So conspicuous is the resemblance that it seems perfectly logical to infer a Designer for the flagellum.’ But, wait, she says: ‘The bacterial flagellum may **look** like an outboard motor, but there is at least one profound difference: the flagellum assembles spontaneously, **without the help of any conscious agent**.’ (emphasis added) Acknowledging that ‘the self-assembly of such a complex machine almost defies the imagination,’ Dr. Applegate assures her readers that this is not really a problem because ‘Natural forces work **LIKE MAGIC**.’ Presto, chango, something appears!” (“Behe Critic on Bacterial Flagellum,” *Evolution News & Views*, Aug. 25, 2010).

The Cargo Protein

This tiny device actually walks along tubular pathways transporting vesicles or membrane-enclosed containers to and from the plasma membrane to other parts of the cell such as the Golgi apparatus. The vesicles have different

functions depending on what protein materials they contain. They store, transport, or digest cellular products. The tubular pathways themselves are extremely complex. They form out of the centrosome located near the cell's nucleus and provide not only transportation pathways but also a framework to hold organelles such as the mitochondria. The pathways are dynamic, forming and deforming according to the cell's needs.

The Planthoppers' Gears

A species of planthopping insect, *Issus coleoptratus*, has functional gears."The two interlocking gears on the insect's hind legs help synchronize the legs when the animal jumps" ("Scientists Just Found the First Ever Example of Mechanical Gears in Nature," *Business Insider*, Sept. 13, 2013).

Malcolm Burrows, emeritus professor of neurobiology at Cambridge University, and a colleague captured the gears' motion using high-speed video. As the bug prepares to leap, "it meshes the gear teeth of one leg with those of the other, like cocking a gun; then, the insect releases its legs in one smooth-explosive motion."

There are 10 to 12 gear teeth on each leg that mesh with the gears on the opposite leg to "synchronize the movement of the hind legs to within about 30 microseconds of each other."

The gears are only found in young planthoppers. After the final molt, the gears are lost and the adults use friction between the legs to achieve the same effect.

Evolutionists theorize that "adults may ditch their gears partly because gear teeth can break, jeopardizing the insect's survival."

This is a ridiculous idea. It assumes that incredibly complicated things can simply evolve because there is a need for them and can be "ditched" when the need ceases. This does not address the real issue, which is how can such things

evolve? What is the mechanism of evolution? The information to build and operate the living gear machinery must be in the creature's DNA. Evolutionists have never proven that genetic information can evolve to create organs and creatures. Mutations don't produce such things. Mutations are errors in the genetic code and the vast majority of them

Evolution supposedly occurs in tiny steps that are then selected by "natural selection." How could the gear mechanism evolve gradually? Burrows says, "If there were to be a slight timing difference between the legs, then the body would start to spin." This illustrates the folly of the idea that evolution could produce such things gradually. A partly working gear mechanism would hinder rather than help its locomotion.

Biomimetics

Biomimetics is the study of nature's "designs" by human engineers.

"Biomimetic materials research is becoming a rapidly growing and enormously promising field" (P. Fratzl, "Biomimetic materials research," *Journal of the Royal Society*, 2007, cited from Jonathan Sarfati, *By Design*, p. 113).

"The act of copying nature to address a design problem isn't new, but over the past decade, the practice has moved from obscure scientific journals and into the mainstream. It even has a name: biomimicry. Its advocates view nature as not just a resource to be mined but also a mentor" ("Back to Nature," *Reader's Digest*, June-July 2011, p. 166).

The very existence of this rapidly-growing scientific field is a powerful witness to the fact that "nature" is intelligently designed.

John McMasters, an aeronautics engineer with Boeing, says that lessons learned from nature will play an increasing role in new aircraft (“Flying Creatures May Help Create Aviation of Future,” *USA Today*, Feb. 13, 2007).

In 2012 the San Diego Zoo established a “Centre for Bioinspiration” to serve as “a product incubator that is intended to help advance biologically inspired products.” According to a report commissioned by the zoo in 2011, biomimicry could generate as much as \$300 billion annually to the U.S. economy by 2025.

Edward Kelley copied the human eye’s design to create a camera that has 70 times better clarity and resolution in dealing with lens flare. The human eye “ingeniously” uses liquid to fill the gap between the lens and retina to overcome this problem.

University of Florida engineering professor Anthony Brennan developed Sharklet by studying how shark’s skin prevents fouling by algae and barnacles via a microscopic toothlike pattern of the scales. By mimicking these amazingly complex scales, Sharklet reduces fouling on ships by 85% (*Reader’s Digest*, June-July 2011, p. 167).

Japanese engineer Eiji Nakatsu patterned the nose of a bullet train after the design of the kingfisher’s beak (*Reader’s Digest*, p. 168). This made it possible for the train to enter narrow tunnels at high speed without producing a sonic boom.

Fish’s WhalePower Corporation markets fan blades that move 25% more air and use 20% less electricity than conventional fan blades by mimicking the bumps on the flipper of the humpback whale (*Reader’s Digest*, p. 170). Biologist Frank Fish discovered that the flipper bumps, or tubercles, reduce drag and improve aerodynamics, which is contrary to conventional engineering wisdom that says that a smooth leading edge reduces drag.

Architect Mick Pearce created the non-air-conditioned cooling system of a building in Harare, Zimbabwe, by

mimicking the design of termite mounds. “The insects cooled their mud homes using an INGENIOUS system that catches breezes at the base of the mounds” (*Reader’s Digest*, p. 169).

Engineers are studying gecko foot hairs for the design of space-age adhesives. “Geckos can do things that we just can’t do with current robotics and adhesive technology” (K. Autumn, *San Francisco Chronicle*, June 19, 2000). A team of scientists led by Andre Geim, of the University of Manchester, invented a self-cleaning adhesive tape modeled on the gecko’s foot (Jonathan Sarfati, *By Design*, p. 108).

The deep-sea sponge *Euplectella* grows glassy fibers that are so superior to man-made fibers that Geri Richmond of the University of Oregon says, “It’s such a wonderful example of how exquisite nature is as a designer and builder of complex systems. We’re in the stone age compared to nature” (“Sponge Has Natural Glass Fiber Optics,” *San Francisco Chronicle*, Aug. 8, 2000, p. A2).

Mirasol display technology generates colors for mobile phone displays by mimicking the interference of reflected light by microscopic scales on the iridescent surface of the morpho butterfly’s wings (“Amid Wave of Bioinspiration,” *xconomy.com*, Aug. 29, 2012).

Isn’t blind evolution amazing! It creates “ingenious,” “exquisite,” “complex” designs that cause the most brilliant scientists and engineers to marvel.

Engineers are also learning from the cell’s tiny machines.

“The biological cell is equipped with a variety of molecular machines that perform complex mechanical tasks such as cell division or intracellular transport. One can envision employing these biological motors in artificial environments. ... the sheer availability of an entire ready-to-use toolbox of nanosized biological motors is a great opportunity that calls for exploration. ... **At the moment, we can only dream of constructing machines of similar size that possess just a fraction of the functionality of these natural wonders**” (M. van den

Heuvel, and C. Dekker, “Motor Proteins at Work for Nanotechnology,” *Science*, 2007, cited by Sarfati, *By Design*, p. 143).

The study of moth eyes has enabled researchers in Japan (led by Noboru Yamada of Nagaoka University of Technology) to create a new film for covering solar cells that can cut down on reflected light and help capture more power from the sun. Moth eyes are covered with a water-repellent, antireflective coating that makes their eyes among the least reflective surfaces in nature and helps them see in the dark as well as hide from predators (“Insect Eyes Inspire Improved Solar Cells,” Jan. 20, 2011, Physorg.com).

A team of engineers doing biomimetic research into the bombardier beetle won a prestigious award on November 25, 2010. The team, led by Dr. Andy McIntosh, professor of thermodynamic and combustion theory at the University of Leeds, received the Outstanding Contribution to Innovation and Technology title at the Times Higher Education awards in London. They are studying the beetle’s incredibly complicated and amazing defense mechanism that consists of a toxic steam it can blast up to eight inches through an aimable turret. A news report says the research “could inspire new types of nebulisers, needle-free injections, fire extinguishers and powerful fuel injection systems” (“Scientist Wins Prestigious Research Award,” BBC, Dec. 22, 2010). Dr. McIntosh, who is a creationist, said:

“I believe there is much more of nature’s secrets that we could learn from our great Creator if we looked with an eye to see design. ... it was such an experiment and entrepreneurial spirit that led Wilbur and Orville Wright 107 years ago this month, to successfully copy the wing control of birds and so fly a warp wing controlled flying machine to fly along Kitty Hawk beach, in North Carolina” (The Times 2010 award website).

Answers in Genesis observes: “So much for those secularists who continually claim that real scientists can’t be

creationists. Dr. McIntosh has spoken for AiG many times in the UK on creation, plus his own speaking engagements all over the world.”

The Eel

“The prevailing scientific opinion is that all American and European eels lay their eggs under a mass of seaweed 1,500 feet deep in the Sargosso Sea. The pinhead-size eggs hatch to release transparent, ribbonlike creatures with no eyes or mouths. Billions of these tiny, blind creatures are programmed to travel 1,000 to 3,000 miles across the ocean. They get into the Gulf Stream and are carried toward Europe or America. Traveling farther north, they gradually lose their transparency and their eyes and mouths appear. The eels that are not eaten slowly develop hearts and stomachs. Next they swim up rivers and eat everything in sight, dead or alive. They gradually turn yellow and grow up to three feet long. For the first five to eight years, eels are sexless, after which they develop both male and female organs. Once mature, their noses become pointy, they start back downstream, and their skin turns silvery. Apparently they never eat again, because no silver eel has ever been found with food in its stomach. The eels swim thousands of miles to their birthplace in the Sargosso Sea. At this time the eel either becomes a male or a female as one of its sex organs shrivels up. Once they reproduce, the eels die” (*A Closer Look at the Evidence*, December 9).

The Mussel’s Foot

“One of the toughest environments in which to maintain adhesion is underwater. ... Much to a shipbuilder’s chagrin, the mussel is God’s champion of underwater adhesive systems. When a mussel wants to attach to a surface, it uses its plunger-shaped foot to find the spot that will make the

best bond. The foot cleans the point where glue will be attached and then presses down upon the surface, forcing all of the water out. Next the mussel lifts the center section of its plungerlike foot, forming a vacuum to hold itself tightly in place. The final step is for the mussel to pump a chemical adhesive down through its foot, depositing the glue into the vacuum area. This adhesive forms a foamy, shock-absorbing foundation, bonded together with individual threads of glue. The glue itself is made from several different proteins which are mixed in the correct proportions to provide the optimum combination of strength, flexibility, and compressibility for the selected anchor spot. Scientists believe that the specific proteins used change properties as conditions change. This has recently been coined a ‘smart’ material” (*A Closer Look at the Evidence*, October 21).

The Dragonfly

The dragonfly is another amazing icon of creation. There are nearly 5,000 varieties, ranging in size from 3/4 inch to 7 1/2 inches. An extinct variety measured 30 inches from wing tip to wing tip.

Consider its life cycle. It hatches from an egg in a larval form called a nymph that lives in the water and breathes through internal gills. The nymph is ugly and colorless, but it has a “jet propulsion” system whereby it squirts water out rapidly to create fast movement when alarmed. After a few months to three years, the nymph crawls out of the water, begins to breathe air, attaches itself to the stem of a plant, undergoes metamorphosis in one night, and emerges from its larval body as a beautiful flying, air-breathing dragonfly. Though it has lived in the water all its life until this point, it is immediately an expert flyer and spends most of the rest of its life flitting through the air like an insect edition of the hummingbird.

Consider its eyes. It has two large compound eyes, each composed of up to 30,000 facets containing a lens installed at a perfect angle in conjunction with all of the other lenses. This gives it a nearly 360 degree field of vision. It also has three smaller simple eyes called ocelli on the top and front of its head. 80% of its mental processes are devoted to vision. It sees in color and can detect ultraviolet light. The dragonfly's vision is so amazing that it is being studied by the Australian National University with the goal of improving robot flight. Dr. Richard Berry, who is in charge of this project, says, "The ocelli of dragonflies are exceptionally well tuned to provide fast, sensitive and directionally selective information about the world" ("Dragonfly Vision Could Aid Robot Flight," *Science Alert*, Jan. 28, 2009).

Consider its wings. The wing membranes are thinner than paper and very strong. They are reinforced by veins or tubes only 1/10th of a millimeter thick, which act as "spars" for the wings as well as tubes for the cables of the nervous system and for the transportation of the blood fluid.

Consider its flying ability. It can fly up, down, sideways, or backwards and can change direction in an instant. It can glide. It can hover and then rapidly accelerate up to 35 miles per hour. It can beat each pair of wings together or separately; the rear wings can be out of phase with the front wings; and it can even move each wing independently, thus allowing for extreme maneuvers. It can catch other flying insects, such as flies and mosquitoes, in the air, either with its mouth or by forming a little basket with its legs and their bristly spines.

Its amazing neck muscles allow the dragonfly to move its head sideways 180 degrees, back 70 degrees, and down 40 degrees.

Consider its beauty. Dragonflies are brilliantly colored and typically are multi-colored. They can be green, yellow, blue, red, fuchsia, maroon, orange, pink, gold, and black. The colors come in earth tones as well as metallic varieties. These are formed in three ways: pigmentation (e.g., melanin

produces yellows, reds, and browns), wax coating that diffuses light (similar to the coating on some shiny fruits), and light reflecting chitin scales, which perfectly diffract various parts of the light wave to create brilliant metallic colors.

The Bee

“Bees have airspeed gauges, gyroscopes, a ‘compass’ that detects the polarization of sunlight; UV sensors to track the horizon to measure tilt; and two compound eyes, each with 7,000 hexagonal (six-sided) facets. These facets are windows to sub-eyes called ommatidia, which are tiny tubes containing their own lens and light-detecting cells. Each tube points in a different direction, enabling vision over a wide area. Their shape is ideal. They use as little edge-cell material as possible (which is why the honeycomb is also hexagonal), have the least-sharp corners needing less reinforcement, and it is the most symmetrical structure. And they are superb for detecting motion, since a small shift means different facets detect the image” (Jonathan Sarfati, *By Design*, p. 83).

The Bee Dance

Foraging honeybees use a complex dance to point other bees to a source of nectar. Through a figure 8 dance they can give both direction and distance. They also communicate the type and quality of nectar. The direction is indicated by the angle of the dance in reference to the sun (which the bee senses through its ability to detect the polarization pattern of the sky), and if the foraging bee has been in the hive for a length of time, it is able to adjust the angle of its dance to accommodate the changing direction of the sun. The distance, which can be up to 10 miles from the hive, is indicated by a series of straight moves called the waggle run during which the bee waggles its body and buzzes. After each straight waggle run the bee returns to the beginning point of the dance by circling back, first one way, then the other, thus

forming the figure 8. The distance communicated reflects not only actual spacial distance but also the expenditure of flight energy due to such factors as a head wind. The dancing bees also release chemicals that assist in communication. The bees observing the dance can use a squeaking sound to make the dancer pause and give them a taste of the nectar.

The Bee's Chemical Password

Each bee hive has its own unique chemical password. "Beehives are full of scents, yet honeybees are constantly alert to bees that are not members of the hive. Invaders to a hive are killed if they do not have exactly the same scent as the rest of the hive. Entomologists have discovered that all members of an individual hive learn to produce exactly the same chemical password. ... Bees from each hive can instantly tell whether a bee carries that hive's specific chemical password. When bees start a new hive, they develop a new distinctive chemical password" (*A Closer Look at the Evidence*, June 23).

Bee Bread

Bees make a special bread that the young workers must eat in order to produce the food needed by the queen and the developing larvae. "Scientists have discovered that even as bees collect pollen, they begin to work on the bee bread recipe. First they mix secretions from special glands with specific microorganisms, which in turn make enzymes known to release a number of important nutrients from the pollen. Other microbes are added to make antibiotics and fatty acids which keep the 'bread' from spoiling. At the same time unwanted microbes are being removed, the bees are adding honey as a binder to hold it all together. The bees' recipe for bee bread involves the sophisticated use of three areas of science--microbiology, nutritional chemistry, and biochemistry. Does logic allow the conclusion that bees evolved by blind chance and all of these independent processes just fell into place?" (*A Closer Look at the Evidence*, August 15).

The Bat

The bat is so amazing that even atheistic evolutionist Richard Dawkins admits that it has every sign of intelligent design:

“These bats are like miniature spy planes, bristling with sophisticated instrumentation. Their brains are delicately tuned packages of miniaturized electronic wizardry, programmed with the elaborate software necessary to decode a world of echoes in real time. Their faces are often distorted into gargoyle shapes that appear hideous to us until we see them for what they are, exquisitely fashioned instruments for beaming ultrasound in desired directions” (Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, p. 24).

Because of his willful spiritual blindness, Dawkins can write about sophisticated instrumentation, delicately tuned packages, elaborate software, and exquisitely fashioned instruments, and then turn around and claim that it was all evolved by blind forces of chance.

Adam Pitman remarks:

“This sonar is a marvellous discriminator: in a bat-swarm, in cave or night air, a bat can know its own sound among thousands of mobile neighbours, detecting its own signals even if they are 2000 times fainter than background noises. It can ‘see’ prey, such as a fruit-fly, up to 100 feet away by echo location and catch four or five in a second. And this whole auditory system weighs a fraction of a gram! Ounce for ounce, watt for watt, it is millions of times more efficient and more sensitive than the radars and sonars contrived by man” (Pitman, *Adam and Evolution*, p. 219).

The bat’s rate of pulse changes. The brown bat pulses at about 10 per second as it is cruising, but this quickens when it detects an insect and begins to intercept it. The pulses can reach 200 per second. This means that the bat’s brain is

capable of performing incredible amounts of mathematical calculations almost instantly.

Some bats have muscles that enable it to dampen its ear mechanism while it is transmitting its radar pulses. “The muscles contract immediately before the bat emits each outgoing pulse, therefore switching the ears off so that they are not damaged by the loud pulse. Then they relax so that the ear returns to maximal sensitivity just in time for the returning echo. This send/receive switching system works only if split-second accuracy in timing is maintained. The bat called *Tadarida* is capable of alternately contracting and relaxing its switching muscles 50 times per second, keeping in perfect synchrony with the machine gun-like pulses of ultrasound” (Dawkins, pp. 27, 28).

Many bats produce a sound that changes pitch. It is basically a high-pitched shriek that sweeps down about an octave. This technique is used in modern radar and is called “chirp radar.” This gives the bat even more sophisticated ability to distinguish between returning echoes. Since its emissions begin at a higher pitch, its brain knows that if a returning echo is a higher pitch it is from a more distant object. “When an echo from a distant object finally arrives back at the bat, it will be an ‘older’ echo than an echo that is simultaneously arriving back from a near object. It will therefore be of higher pitch. When the bat is faced with clashing echoes from several objects, it can apply the rule of thumb: higher pitch means farther away” (Dawkins, p. 29).

Consider the amazing intelligence, though, that is required for a bat to apply such a “rule of thumb”!

The bat is found in the fossil record perfectly formed from the very beginning. The following quotes are from scientists who were interviewed for the book *Evolution: The Grand Experiment* (volume 1) by Dr. Carl Werner:

“There’s a ten-million-year period of early mammal evolution where you would guess that there’d be some sort of bat precursor, but once again, nothing. Bingo, they

just show up” (Dr. Gary Morgan, Assistant Curator of Paleontology, New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science and a specialist in bat evolution).

“We have no evidence for this evolution. The bats appear perfectly developed in the Eocene” (Dr. Gunter Viehl, Curator of the Jura Museum in Eichstatt, Germany).

Corn

One corn seed typically produces a stalk bearing two cobs, each with 400 to 600 kernels per cob. Thus, it multiplies itself 1,000 fold and more in one generation. If you replant the 1,000 seeds from one corn stalk and each grows to maturity--each stalk bearing two cobs with an average of 500 kernels per cob (2,000 X 500)--you get one million kernels of corn. That’s just the second generation. And if you plant those one million kernels and each stalk grows to maturity, you get a billion corn seeds in just three generations!

This is an example of the blessing with which God has filled the world for man’s benefit.

“Such is the tremendous reproductive power of DNA, especially in primary producer plants that must generate sufficient food-web biomass so all consumers--including we humans--can survive” (Kenneth Poppe, *Exposing Darwinism’s Weakest Link*, p. 33).

Corn is self-pollinating, in that each stalk has both male and female flowers. The females are the ears that send out strands of silk that grow out of the top of the ear. (The flower is actually composed of the kernel, which is the ovule, and the silk, which is the stigma.) Each kernel of corn is individually pollinated by a strand of silk, which is covered with fine, sticky hairs that catch the pollen. The male flowers on the tassels release their pollen into the air. The pollen is held in anthers which contain large numbers of pollen grains, and when released the grains usually settle within 20 to 50 feet of the stalk. Thus it is advised to plant corn in blocks

rather than in long rows. Each tassel contains from 2 to 5 million pollen grains, which translates to 2,000 to 5,000 pollen grains for each silk of the ear shoot.

The emergence of the silk and the release of the pollen must be precisely timed. The pollen shed usually begins two or three days prior to silk emergence and continues for five to eight days, and it is shed in late morning after the dew has dried off the tassels (Ohio State University Agronomy Facts).

The pollen shed is intelligent, responding to climatic conditions, stopping when the tassel is too wet or too dry and beginning again when temperature conditions are favorable. By this means the pollen is rarely washed off the silk by rain since it doesn't release during wet conditions. When the pollen comes into contact with the silk, it starts the growth of a pollen tube down the length of the silk and enters the female flower in 12 to 28 hours.

Water

Water is a near miracle substance that is perfectly designed for life.

“It behaves as if it doesn't have to follow the standard rules of chemistry. ... No molecule besides water has these amazing properties” (Kenneth Poppe, *Exposing Darwinism's Weakest Link*, pp. 73, 81).

Most molecules are either polar or non-polar, either symmetrical or asymmetrical, but H₂O is different. It is slightly polar and slightly symmetrical. “By having the two bonded hydrogens at a partial angle, this still allows the molecule two different areas of magnetic polarity, but only with a lesser attraction” (Poppe, p. 76). This allows the molecule to be very dynamic and thus accommodate a great variety of conditions. It “helps create many of its magic capabilities.”

Water remains a liquid at normal earth temperatures, instead of a gas. This allows it to be usable by all living creatures. Whereas CO_2 , which is twice as heavy as H_2O , is always a gas. "By chemistry's dictates, water should immediately join carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, leaving our planet's surface completely dry" (Poppe p. 80).

The reason this doesn't happen is H_2O 's cohesion property (the hydrogen bond). The molecules "cling to one another with enough strength to stay in your glass on a hot summer day," but the cohesion is weak enough to allow for gradual evaporation, which is necessary for the planet's water cycle. "It is light enough to easily vaporize, while being dense enough to float the largest of objects" (Poppe, p. 81).

Water floats when frozen, which makes it possible for marine life to exist. If ice did not float, bodies of water would freeze from the bottom up. The reason that frozen water floats is because it does not act like other molecules. Instead of being more dense as a solid, it is less dense and thus frozen water rises to the top of liquid water. "As water molecules lose their kinetic energy of motion, the liquid's volume begins to contract as per normal. But at the last moment, as the molecules begin to configure in a crystalline structure at 32 degrees F. (0 degrees C.), the partial polarity actually forces them to align in a slightly expanded pattern."

Because of water's cohesive and adhesive properties, the molecules cling to one another and are drawn by one another. An example of this process is the way water will move up a straw higher than the water level of the glass in which it is inserted. This property allows water to move up a plant or tree without a pump or suction action provided by the tree. For example, a cottonwood tree takes up 150 gallons of water (half a ton) a day. "Imagine a plant's xylem tissue in the stem, filled with microscopically hollow sieve tubes and cylindrical vessels stacked on each other, and up the molecules go, being drawn rather than pushed. The combination of cohesive and adhesive forces allow the molecules to gradually work their

way up the stem or trunk, move through the branches and into the veins of the leaf, and eventually reach the stoma in the leaves. Then solar power causes them to quickly evaporate into the air, allowing others underneath to move up. Note that this requires no energy expenditure on the part of the plant. Upward water movement will even take place in cut flowers without roots, keeping them fresh for a few days” (Poppe, pp. 82, 83).

Another example of water’s cohesive property is the action of a water drop. For example, it holds its shape when it falls to earth and clings to leaves to allow for slow evaporation. “Imagine how fast the essential morning dew would disappear if the moisture were smeared as a thin glaze over the plant’s surface” (Poppe, *Exposing Darwinism’s Weakest Link*, p. 84).

Water has a much higher than expected “specific heat,” so that it warms slowly and retains heat longer. Since about 75% of the earth is covered with water, this property allows the earth to maintain the proper temperature for life. “It does not go through the tremendous daytime-to-nighttime temperature extremes common to all other planets. Not only does this moderate the Earth’s overall temperature ranges, but it keeps lakes, ponds, and even puddles from day/night heat surges and crashes that would dramatically impact life” (Poppe, p. 84).

This property of water, which gives it extraordinary temperature stability, also allows warm-blooded animals (whose bodies are composed of 70% water) to survive.

Water is a universal solvent.

Water is an effective transport substance. “It is the only medium that can circulate absolutely any substance that animals require for life” (Poppe, *Exposing Darwinism’s Weakest Link*, p. 86). Water can even transport non-polar molecules like oils (and fats and waxes) by creating a hydration shell, which is an envelope surrounding the oil

molecule composed of several water molecules that are linked by their hydrogen bonds.

The following is from "The Coherence of an Engineered World," D. Halsmer, J. Asper, N. Roman, and T. Todd, *International Journal of Design and Nature and Ecodynamics*, Vol. 4(1):47-65, 2009:

The remarkable properties of water are numerous. Its very high specific heat maintains relatively stable temperatures both in oceans and organisms. As a liquid, its thermal conductivity is four times any other common liquid, which makes it possible for cells to efficiently distribute heat. On the other hand, ice has a low thermal conductivity, making it a good thermal shield in high latitudes. A latent heat of fusion only surpassed by that of ammonia tends to keep water in liquid form and creates a natural thermostat at 0°C. Likewise, the highest latent heat of vaporization of any substance - more than five times the energy required to heat the same amount of water from 0°C-100°C - allows water vapor to store large amounts of heat in the atmosphere. This very high latent heat of vaporization is also vital biologically because at body temperature or above, the only way for a person to dissipate heat is to sweat it off.

Water's remarkable capabilities are definitely not only thermal. A high vapor tension allows air to hold more moisture, which enables precipitation. Water's great surface tension is necessary for good capillary effect for tall plants, and it allows soil to hold more water. Water's low viscosity makes it possible for blood to flow through small capillaries. A very well documented anomaly is that water expands into the solid state, which keeps ice on the surface of the oceans instead of accumulating on the ocean floor. Possibly the most important trait of water is its unrivaled solvency abilities, which allow it to transport great amounts of minerals to immobile organisms and also hold all of the contents of blood. It is also only mildly reactive, which keeps it from harmfully reacting as it dissolves substances.

Recent research has revealed how water acts as an efficient lubricator in many biological systems from snails to human digestion. By itself, water is not very effective in this role, but it works well with certain additives, such as some glycoproteins.

The sum of these traits makes water an ideal medium for life. Literally, every property of water is suited for supporting life. ...

All these traits are contained in a simple molecule of only three atoms. One of the most difficult tasks for an engineer is to design for multiple criteria at once. ... Satisfying all these criteria in one simple design is an engineering marvel. Also, the design process goes very deep since many characteristics would necessarily be changed if one were to alter fundamental physical properties such as the strong nuclear force or the size of the electron.

Note that these secular scientists, who believe in evolution, are forced to call water “an engineering marvel.” Indeed, it is, and the logical conclusion is that it was designed by a Great Intelligence.

Some books that deal with design are as follows:

Body by Design by Alan Gillen

By Design: Evidence for Nature's Intelligent Designer by Jonathan Sarfati

The Cell's Design by Fazale Rana

A Closer Look at the Evidence by Richard & Tina Kleiss

Darwin's Design Dilemma by Lowell Coker

Hallmarks of Design by Stuart Burgess

If Animals Could Talk by Werner Gitt

Fearfully and Wonderfully Made by Paul Brand

The Ape-Men

“The once-popular fresco showing a single file of marching hominids becoming ever more vertical, tall, and hairless now appears to be a fiction” (J.J. Hublin, *Nature*, Jan. 27, 2000).

The search for the missing link between men and apes has been motivated by Darwin’s “theory” of evolution. Since evolutionary paleoanthropologists are searching for evidence to prove their theories and have no interest in disproving it, it is not surprising that they have been deceived repeatedly. Like Percival Lowell who saw canals on Mars, the Darwinian paleoanthropologists have seen ape-men living on earth.

Some evolutionists complain when we use the term ape-man to describe man’s alleged evolutionary ancestors. For example, the textbook *Teaching about Evolution*, published by the National Academy of Sciences in America, speaks of “the misconception that humans evolved from apes,” but this is a bogus complaint. Even George Simpson, a leading atheistic evolutionist, called this type of argument “pussyfooting.” He said:

“In fact, that earlier ancestor would certainly be called an ape or monkey in popular speech by anyone who saw it. Since the terms *ape* and *monkey* are defined by popular usage, man’s ancestors were apes or monkeys (or successively both). It is pusillanimous if not dishonest for an informed investigator to say otherwise” (quoted by W.R. Bird, *The Origin of Species Revisited*, 1991, Vol. 1, p. 233).

The more I study the history of the search for the supposed missing link between man and animal, the more amazed I am that they have gotten away with foisting such a myth upon the world. The only explanation is found in the Bible, which says that man is in rebellion to God and under the spiritual power of the devil, who is called “the god of this world” (2

Corinthians 4:4). The Bible also says that in the last days men will scoff at the miracles of the Bible (2 Peter 3).

For more than a century, evolutionists have gotten away with a massive deception. The charts depicting the rise of man from an ape and the fanciful paintings and models of ape-men have influenced multitudes of people to think that there is scientific evidence for the evolution of man from the animal kingdom. The fact is that there is no such evidence. The charts and depictions are based on nothing more than vain speculation and evolutionary presumption.

Terms

Hominid -- humans and their alleged evolutionary ancestors

Homonoid -- humans and all apes and monkeys

Paleoanthropology -- the study of fossilized humans (this term replaced the older term “human paleontology”)

Introductory facts to keep in mind

1. The field of human evolution is rife with selfish, petty quarreling, preening pride, sensuality, and outright fraud.

Consider the following statements from evolutionists themselves:

“The search for man’s past has been littered with vain hopes and invented hominids” (Francis Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe*, p. 172).

“... almost every ancestor of man ever proposed suffers from disqualifying liabilities that are not widely publicized. I gradually came to realize that the presentation of fossil evidence for human evolution has long been and still is more of a market phenomenon than a disinterested scientific exercise” (William Fix, *The Bone Peddlers*, p. xxv).

“This is quite a strange science, all in all. Too often there is not even a pretense at objectivity; not even a hint that there really is more than one possible explanation. Anyone questioning the credentials of a particular

missing link is portrayed as having missed the boat--until something embarrassing happens to discredit the ancestor. Then that 'ancestor' is put to one side as quietly as possible, and the profession moves on to other fossils" (Fix, p. 129).

"Piltdown was not an unfortunate lapse of scientific poise in the infancy of this discipline, but was symptomatic of its standard operating procedure" (Fix, *The Bone Peddlers*, p. 55).

"We've got to have some ancestors. We'll pick those. Why? 'Because we know they have to be there, and these are the best candidates.' That's by and large the way it has worked. I am not exaggerating" (Gareth Nelson of the American Museum of Natural History, cited by Phillip Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, p. 76).

"If this book were to catalogue all the mistaken claims about hominid fossils made by layman and expert alike, it would have to be far longer than it is" (Maitland Edey, *The Missing Link*).

"Ever since Darwin's work inspired the notion that fossils linking modern man and extinct ancestor would provide the most convincing proof of human evolution, preconceptions have led evidence by the nose in the study of fossil man" (John Reader, *Missing Links*, 1981).

"Anthropologists dig up these bones so they can beat each other over the head with them" (David Jefferson, "This Anthropologist Has a Style That Is Bone of Contention," *Wall Street Journal*, Jan. 31, 1995).

"The study of human origins seems to be a field in which each discovery raises the debate to a more sophisticated level of uncertainty" (Christopher Stringer, "The Legacy of Homo Sapiens," *Scientific American*, May 1993, p. 138).

"In human paleontology the consensus depends on who shouts loudest" (cited by J.S. Jones, "A Thousand and One Eves," *Nature*, May 31, 1990).

“Compared to other sciences, the mythic element is greatest in paleoanthropology” (Andrew Hill, review of *The Myths of Human Evolution* by Nils Eldredge and Ian Tattersall, *American Scientist*, March-April 1984, p. 189).

“So much glamour still attaches to the theme of the missing-link, and to man’s relationships with the animal world, that it may always be difficult to exorcise from the comparative study of Primates, living and fossil, the kind of myths which the unaided eye is able to conjure out of a well of wishful thinking” (Solly Zuckerman, *Beyond the Ivory Tower*, p. 94).

“[Anthropology is a field of science] mainly concerned with conjecture and speculation” (Solly Zuckerman, *From Apes to Warlords*, p. 14).

“Descriptions of fossils from people who yearn to cradle their ancestors in their hands ought to be scrutinized as carefully as a letter of recommendation from a job applicant’s mother” (Don Johanson, cited by Phillip Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, p. 81).

“When the only people who can comment are the discoverers or friends of the discoverers, there is no sense of independent observer. We’re not practicing science. We’re practicing opera” (Milford Wolpoff, cited by Ann Gibbons, “Glasnost for Hominids: Seeking Access to Fossils,” *Science*, Aug. 30, 2002).

“The tendency towards aggrandizement of a rare or unique specimen on the part of its finder or the person to whom its initial scientific description has been entrusted, springs naturally from human egoism and is almost ineradicable” (Earnest Hooton, *Apes, Men and Morons*, 1973, p. 231).

“... we select among alternative sets of research conclusions in accordance with our biases and preconceptions--a process that is, at once, both political and subjective” (Geoffrey Clark, Arizona State University anthropologist, “Through a Glass Darkly,” *Conceptual*

Issues in Modern Human Origins Research, edited by G.A. Clark and C.M. Willermet, 1997, p. 76).

“... in paleoanthropology, the patterns we perceive are as likely to result from our unconscious mindsets as from the evidence itself” (Ian Tattersall, curator of the American Museum of Natural History, “Paleoanthropology and Preconception,” *Contemporary Issues on Human Evolution*, edited by Meikle, Howell, and Jablonski, 1996, p. 53).

In *Bones of Contention*, Roger Lewin documents the amazing bickering between top paleoanthropologists. Elliot Smith, Arthur Keith, Arthur Smith Woodward, Henry Osborn, Earnest Hooton, and others fiercely rejected Raymond Dart’s “theory” of the Taung Child and *Australopithecus* as an ancestor of man. Solly Zuckerman fell out with Raymond Dart and others over *Australopithecus*. David Pilbeam had an ongoing sharp contention with Louis Leakey. Elwyn Simons fell out with Pilbeam over *Ramapithecus* and with Louis Leakey over many things. Russell Tuttle complained that Don Johanson “wants to hog the limelight” (Lewin, p. 173). Wilfred Le Gros Clark fell out with Louis Leakey over *Homo habilis*. Richard Leakey fell out with Donald Johanson over both *Homo habilis* and *Australopithecus*. Theirs was “the most bitter enmity that paleoanthropology has ever known” (*Ancestral Passions*, p. 458). When Leakey and Johanson appeared together on *Cronkite’s Universe* in 1981, they got into a fierce argument on camera. When Johanson produced a drawing of his proposed “human family tree” with a prominent place for “Lucy,” Leakey slashed a large X through it and replaced it with a question mark (Lewin, p. 17). Tim White fell out with the Leakeys over *Australopithecus afarensis*. Though White once worked with the Leakeys, their “personal and professional relationship effectively ceased in 1985” (Lewin, p. 172).

In his falling out with Louis Leakey, Elwyn Simons defined the “Leakey syndrome” as follows: “The fossils I find are the

important ones and are on the direct line to man, preferably bearing names I have coined, whereas the fossils you find are of lesser importance and are all on side branches of the tree" (Lewin, *Bones of Contention*, p. 132).

That's not just the "Leaky syndrome"; it is the syndrome of the majority of famous paleoanthropologists.

A biography of the Leakeys describes conferences in which paleontologists "were all shouting at one another; there were loud arguments, people getting white around their mouths, glaring at each other; it was a tremendous fracas" (Virginia Morell, *Ancestral Passions*, p. 430). The rivalry between teams was "like a football match ... it wasn't purely a group of disinterested scientists trying to get it right" (Morell, p. 421).

Ancestral Passions, the 638-page biography of the Leakey family by Virginia Morell, is well named. In many ways Louis Leakey was a scoundrel. He was a multiple adulterer who left his first wife, Frida, when she was eight months pregnant with his second child and had no further contact with the children for the next 20 years. He was "always after other men's wives." He fudged scientific reports. He allowed his preconceptions to rule the interpretation of his fossils. Even his second wife Mary said he made "decisions about things without really any valid reasons that one could put one's finger on" (p. 311). He often replaced science with guesswork. He grew up the son of an African missionary and Bible translator, but he rejected the Bible and believed in Pierre Teilhard's New Age "Omega point." Louis' second wife, Mary, bore him children but she said, "I had no intention of allowing motherhood to disrupt my work as an archaeologist" (*Ancestral Passions*, p. 124). The native workers called her "a very *kali* [hot-tempered] teacher." She was ruthlessly fickle, so much so that even longtime friends "could find themselves suddenly scorned, dismissed, and cut out of her life" (p. 434). Louis's son Richard was a prima donna in his own right. He left his first wife after she had their first child and married a co-worker. The Leakeys

couldn't get along with other paleoanthropologists and they couldn't get along with one another. Mary often observed, "Every Leakey has to have his or her own empire, and heaven help any other Leakey who sets foot in it uninvited" (p. 424). She said, "We were fighting like mad at the time. We were disagreeing about virtually everything to do with human evolution. Interference from Richard would be more likely to push me in the other direction" (p. 290). So much for unbiased science uncolored by human emotions.

2. Major fossil discoveries result in wealth and fame.

Louis Leakey was the first certified rock star in the ape-man field. The Leakey family could be called paleoanthropology's First Family. Louis was joined in fame by his second wife, Mary, and the family celebrity was carried on by their son Richard.

"It is certainly true that, as leaders in their discipline, they enjoy a public notoriety greater than even the most prominent nuclear physicist or molecular biologist. Richard Leakey has dined at Ronald Reagan's White House and is to be seen promoting Rolex watches in full-page advertisements in *The New Yorker* magazine. ... [Donald] Johanson, meanwhile, is an accomplished television personality and member of California's exclusive Bohemian Club, in company, for instance, with Henry Kissinger and Gordon Getty, and is director of his own internationally known institute" (Roger Lewin, *Bones of Contention*, pp. 152, 153).

3. It is impossible to determine any sort of evolutionary association between fossilized creatures.

How could you possibly determine such a thing? In 1999, Henry Gee, chief science writer for *Nature* magazine, made the following admission:

"No fossil is buried with its birth certificate. ... [Each fossil] is an isolated point, with no knowable connection to any other given fossil, and all float around in an

overwhelming sea of gaps. ... To take a line of fossils and claim that they represent a lineage is not a scientific hypothesis that can be tested, but an assertion that carries the same authority as a bedtime story--amusing, perhaps even instructive, but not scientific" (*In Search of Deep Time*).

4. The evolution of an ape to a man would require miraculous changes just in the matter of stature.

There are ten major structural features that allow man to walk upright: fine balance, a flat face to look both ahead and down easily, upright skull, straight back, fully extendable hips, angled femur bones, fully extendable knee joints that lock in the upright position, long legs, arched feet, and strong big toes as opposed to the big toe of apes which is like a flexible thumb (Stuart Burgess, *Hallmarks of Design*, p. 165).

Evolving from ape to man would require the blind evolution of and perfect coordination of these wonderful structures from the genetic and cellular level up.

5. In spite of more than a century of vast, expensive research, the scientifically proven link between ape and man has never been found.

"Human evolution has been falsified in that virtually every chart of human evolution since 1990 has question marks or dotted lines at the most crucial point--the transition from the australopithecines to true humans" (Melvin Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, p. 326).

This fact is not usually admitted in textbooks and museums, but a glance at the evolutionary fossil trees proves it. For example, the human evolutionary tree at the American Museum of Natural History has a gap between the *Australopithecine* (Lucy, Ardi) and the *Homo* classes (*erectus*, *heidelberg*, *neanderthal*, *sapiens*). There is no scientific reason not to believe that the australopithecines are all apes and the *Homo* classes are all humans. There is no proven link between the two. We don't agree, of course, with the premise

that there was any sort of “species” difference between *Homo ergaster*, *Homo erectus*, *Homo neandertalensis*, etc., and *Homo sapiens*. They were ALL *Homo sapiens*, all sons of Adam! But the fact remains that the evolutionists themselves admit that they have NOT found the link between the human category and that of the various categories of apes. Evolutionary bluster does not change this fact.

6. The evolutionary concept of ascent from “stone age cave man” to “true” man ignores the fact that some “modern men” live in “stone age” fashion.

There is no need to resort to the myth that man evolved from a stone age. Modern man exhibits a vast variety of culture and living conditions, from caves to castles. On his sailing journey, Charles Darwin encountered the Fugeians who lived in Tierra del Fuego. They were “stone age” people: naked, making fire using flint, using rocks as hammers, and making stone points for hunting. As Melvin Lubenow observes, “They had no adhesives or glue for hafting tools, no domesticated plants, no lamps, no metallurgy, no musical instruments, no needles or awls for sewing, no nets for fishing, no pottery, no rope, no long-distance trade, and no writing” (*Bones of Contention*, p. 142). Consider the Tasmanians, who lived on the island of Tasmania near Australia. They looked like Neanderthals, with heavy brow ridges. They were nomadic hunters and lived very primitive lives “in simplicity with nature.” In fact, their tools were even less complex than those of the Neanderthals. They didn’t use bone, for example.

7. The variety found among fossilized supposed pre-humans (e.g, *Homo ergaster*, *Homo habilis*, *Homo erectus*, *Homo neandertalensis*) is no different than the variety found among “modern” humans.

In natural history museums the skulls and bones of various “kinds” of “pre-humans” are compared to demonstrate that

they are not the same, but this can be done with “modern” humans.

Among humans there is a huge variety of brain size, skull shape, stature, and posture. Brain size extends from less than 800 cc to about 2,200 cc (Lubenow, p. 309). Sultan Kosen of Turkey is eight feet tall and Khagendra Thapa Magar of Nepal is two feet tall. Jon Brower Minnoch weighed 1,400 pounds and Lucia Zarate weighed 4.7 pounds.

8. Evolutionists typically only talk about the fossils that fit their theories and hide the evidence that disproves it.

This has been their method from the beginning. Eugene Dubois, the discoverer of so-called Java man, hid the fact that he had found skulls of “modern man” in the same rock strata.

Melvin Lubenow says: “The key is to attempt to study all of the human fossils that have been discovered rather than just those that evolutionists choose to show us in trying to prove human evolution. That is why you seldom, if ever, find complete fossil charts in books on human evolution” (*Bones of Contention*, p. 20).

Lubenow uses little-known evolutionary data to disprove evolution. For example, he shows that 11 *homo sapiens* fossils have been found that are dated between 1.6 and 3.5 million years old. That is as old as the supposed missing links such as *Homo erectus*, *Homo habilis*, *Australopithecus africanus*, and *Australopithecus afarensis* (Lucy). According to Charles Darwin’s principles, it is impossible for *Homo sapiens* to have evolved from creatures with which they lived contemporaneously.

A fossil elbow known as KNM-KP 271 was discovered in 1965 in Kanapoi, Kenya, by Bryan Patterson of Harvard University. Subsequent analysis found it to be “indistinguishable from modern *Homo sapiens*” (Henry McHenry, University of California, Davis, “Fossils and the Mosaic Nature of Human Evolution,” *Science*, Oct. 31, 1975, p. 428). David Pilbeam of Harvard said that the analysis

“aligns it UNEQUIVOCALLY with man rather than with the chimpanzee, the hominoid most similar to man in this anatomical region” (*The Evolution of Man*, 1970, p. 15). But evolutionists have refused to label it *Homo sapiens*. Instead, they have labeled it *Australopithecus africanus*. Why? W.W. Howells explains:

“The humeral fragment from Kanapoi, with a date of about 4.4 million, could not be distinguished from *Homo sapiens* morphologically or by multivariate analysis by Patterson and myself in 1967 (or by much more searching analysis by others since then). We suggested that it might represent *Australopithecus* because at that time allocation to *Homo* seemed preposterous, although it would be the correct one without the time element” (“*Homo erectus* in human descent,” in Sigmon and Cybulski, *Homo erectus*, pp. 79-80, cited from Lubenow, p. 68).

The evolutionists looked at the evidence and refused to believe it, preferring to see what they wanted to see rather than what actually exists. Sure, they had their reasons, but they were based on evolutionary *assumptions* rather than scientific *evidence*.

9. Evolutionists have often been caught going far beyond the evidence and even doctoring the evidence to fit their theories.

The reconstruction of the skull of KNM-ER 1470 by Alan Walker, Bernard Wood, and Meave Leakey is an example. It was found in hundreds of pieces, and the reconstruction featured a large brain capacity but with a slight ape-like slant to the face. Melvin Lubenow writes:

“Soon after casts were available, I purchased one of skull 1470 from the National Museums of Kenya, Nairobi. As I studied it, I sensed that there might be a problem with the reconstruction of the face. ... The skull was far too large for an *australopithecine*. It cried out, ‘Homo!’ However, the face had a bit of an *australopithecine* slant to it. Pictures taken before plaster was used to fill in the

missing pieces reveal that the face of the fossil is rather free floating. It is attached to the skull only at the top, with nothing to stabilize the slant of the face. Further, the maxilla (upper jaw) is not attached to the rest of the face. **Others have also questioned the reconstruction of skull 1470. On several occasions, Richard Leakey protested that the skull was assembled in the only way possible. But it seems that Leakey was not being straightforward.** Science writer Roger Lewin, who was associated with Leakey on several projects, tells a different story regarding skull 1470. 'One point of uncertainty was the angle at which the face attached to the cranium. Alan Walker remembers an occasion when he, Michael Day, and Richard Leakey were studying the two sections of the skull. You could hold the maxilla forward, and give it a long face, or you could tuck it in, making the face short, he recalls. How you held it really depended on your preconceptions' (Roger Lewin, *Bones of Contention*, p. 160). ... **There is no question that bias intervened in the reconstruction of skull 1470. Tucked under, the skull would look much like a modern human. Instead, the face was given an *australopithecine* slant to make it look more like a transitional form**" (Melvin Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, pp. 328, 329).

We will see that the reconstructions of other "ape-men" are highly doubtful, including Java Man, Peking Man, Ardi, and Lucy.

10. Since evolutionists refuse to be bound by their own evidence it is impossible to disprove their theories.

Melvin Lubenow says:

"According to the basic principles of the philosophy of science, a theory must be falsifiable if it is a legitimate scientific theory. How could the theory of evolution be falsified? Supposedly it would be falsified if fossils are found that are woefully out of order from what evolution would predict. Many such fossils have been found. KNM-KP 271 is just one of them. However, evolutionists ignore

the morphology of fossils that do not fall into the proper evolutionary time period. They wave their magic wand to change the taxon of these fossils. Thus it is impossible to falsify the concept of human evolution. It is like trying to nail jelly to the wall. That evolutionists resort to this manipulation of the evidence is a 'confession' on their part that the fossil evidence does not conform to evolutionary theory. It also reveals that the concept of human evolution is a philosophy, not a science" (Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, p. 68).

11. The Sima de los Huesos Cave proves that various groups of "Homo" lived and worked together.

A team led by Juan Luis Arsuaga of the Complutense University of Madrid recovered the remains of roughly 30 individuals that appear to have been buried in the Sima de los Huesos cave in Spain. The fossils are dated to 400,000 years and have been labeled *Homo heidelbergensis*, but they share the characteristics of *Homo sapiens*, *Homo erectus*, and Neanderthal. The individuals vary dramatically both in stature and in cranial characteristics. Chris Stringer says that they share seven similarities with *Homo erectus*, seven with *Homo sapiens*, and ten with Neanderthal ("Secrets of the Pit of the Bones," *Nature*, April 8, 1993). Melvin Lubenow observes:

"... thanks to the extreme variation seen in the Sima de los Huesos fossil collection, the distinctions made by evolutionists between *Homo erectus*, early *Homo sapiens*, Neanderthal, and anatomically modern *Homo sapiens* now fade into insignificance. ... it is obvious that the extreme variation seen in the Sima de los Huesos fossil collection was not caused by evolution. Since they were all a part of the same population living at approximately the same time, evolution cannot be the explanation. ... The Sima de los Huesos fossil assemblage reveals the absurdity of attempting to determine species distinctions in fossil humans" (Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, p. 201).

12. Ape-man art is highly deceptive.

“David Van Reybrouck has studied the pictures and drawings of fossil humans and their reconstructions, starting with those of the original Feldhofer Neanderthal. Writing in the journal *Antiquity*, he states that these pictures, drawings, and reconstructions: (1) always go beyond the archaeological data; (2) always involve the speculations and prejudices of the fossil discoverers, who advise the artists; (3) always involve interpretations that are ‘theory’ laden; (4) always are nonobjective but are trusted as being accurate; and (5) are used so extensively because they sell evolution so effectively. He concludes, ‘A good drawing is like a Trojan horse; to be rhetorically effective, its interpretation must be hidden inside’” (Melvin Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, p. 38).

Consider the reconstructions by Ernst Haeckel. His book on natural history featured a two-page spread of the supposed evolution of man from apes. One page contained 12 species of apes on profile, while the facing page contained 12 species of man. The apes were modified to be more man-like, while the black men that are supposed to be on the lower scale of evolution were modified to be more ape-like. It was not science; it was a lie.

Consider the *Parade of Man*, which appeared as a 36-inch foldout in *Early Man* by F. Clark Howell (one of the Time-Life Nature Library series). It depicts 15 figures evolving from apes to modern humans, but it is a gross deception. As Marvin Lubenow says:

“It is not that more recent fossil discoveries have revealed that the parade was inaccurate. No, the truth is far worse. **The parade was a fake when it was first published.** ... If one reads *Early Man* carefully, the book itself reveals that the parade is fiction. ... Worldwide mailings for advertising purposes were made of the particular pages featuring the parade. The posting of these pages in classrooms and libraries meant that far more people saw the parade than possessed the book. ... Thus, **the visual**

image of the parade sold the concept of human evolution even though the book revealed that the parade was fictitious. The entire chart was outrageous. But the most outrageous part was that the parade started with erect-walking protoapes and apes. Evolutionists knew that these protoapes and apes were not bipedal (walking on two feet). ... An explanatory note in the text of the book read, 'Although protoapes and apes were quadrupedal, all are shown here standing for purposes of comparison.' After all these years, I still am amazed at that statement. First, these fifteen forms were not standing. They were walking across the pages from left to right. Some of them have one foot in the air as they walk. ... **This is raw propaganda--brilliant propaganda, but raw nonetheless. Yet no evolutionist protested this gross lack of scientific objectivity"** (Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, p. 40).

Consider the Lucy reconstructions at various museums. Typically she is depicted with human-like hands and feet and human body proportions, in spite of the fact that the fossils of *Australopithecus afarensis* prove that her hands and feet were ape-like and that her arms were longer than her legs. The creature obviously looked like an ape rather than like a hairy woman! The reconstructions also depict the creature walking upright in a perfectly human fashion, whereas this has been hotly contested even within the evolutionary scientific community. (See the section on "Lucy" under Icons of Evolution.)

Cro-Magnon Man

In evolutionary art, ancient "prehistoric" men are typically depicted as living in caves and eking out a lowly, often beastly, existence.

The so-called Cro-Magnon man (pronounced *man-yon*) is an example. He was not lumped in with the ape-man, but he has long been depicted as an ignorant cave man. This is part of the evolutionary myth that man, after he evolved from the

apes, gradually ascended in his abilities and social graces, discovering fire, inventing rudimentary tools, learning to talk, etc. Over a period of hundreds of thousands of years, man supposedly evolved from cave man to city man.

The first Cro-Magnon skeletons were discovered in a cave in central France in 1868. There were five skeletons: three adult males, an adult female, and an infant. Others were subsequently found in various other parts of Europe, many complete. The skeletons show the same high forehead, upright posture, and slender form as “modern humans.”

The fact is that the Cro-Magnon skeletons represent a type of man that was anything but the rude cave man depicted in *National Geographic*, Time-Life books, public school textbooks, and museums.

His brain was larger than that of men today. Many fossil specimens are over six feet tall. He talked with his fellow man. He made jewelry of pierced shells and bone, made carvings from ivory, designed clay figurines, and made tools of flint and bone. (Examples of all of these articles were discovered in the same cave with the five original Cro-Magnon skeletons.) He made sewing needles and obsidian razors and possibly weaved cloth. He even made musical instruments. He built huts of various materials, including limestone slabs. He was a skilled hunter, using spear, harpoon, bow and arrow. He domesticated animals, perhaps even including the horse.

Cro-Magnon was accomplished in painting, as has been demonstrated by the cave paintings discovered in Altamira, Spain, and Lascaux, France. These color paintings are even three dimensional. Ian Taylor says, “The photographs usually shown in the opening chapters of art history books cannot do justice to these incredible paintings because they are in fact three dimensional. The artist has cleverly made use of the natural contours of the cave walls and ceilings to form the rounding of the belly or the depression for the eye of each one of the colored figures” (*In the Mind of Men*, p. 216).

The cave paintings at Chauvet are supposed to be 30,000 years old, but they are very sophisticated. Consider the following eye-witness report from 1999:

“The whole canvas is nearly 30 feet long, and spread across a magnificent water worn smooth wall of ochre shades. A large bison to the left of the panel is painted as though it is coming out of the wall, only the front half of the giant beast shows. ... To the left of the lions is the great panel of rhinoceros. What a composition! It is out of this world. I counted eight great bodies, but there could be another 6 beasts hidden in the complexity of the drawing. The top rhinoceros is extraordinary. He is shown as having seven enormous front horns making it look as though the animal is thrashing his head up and down in anger. ... On the back wall is painted a solitary horse, with a proudly arched mane above a black face. The body was quite orange in the light of my lamp. His back legs look as though they are hidden by undergrowth, so I got the feeling that he was walking out of the wall. What a masterpiece of drawing. What a feat of imagination” (John Robison, “Visit to the Chauvet Cave, <http://www.bradshawfoundation.com/chauvet/page12.php>).

Alexander Marshack has documented that the Cro-Magnon man understood the movements of the heavenly bodies and maintained lunar calendars. In the 1960s, while working on a writing project for NASA, he found bones that had been cleverly marked by Cro-Magnon to mark the phases of the moon. He described this in his 1972 book *The Roots of Civilization*. Many Cro-Magnon bone calendars have been unearthed.

In fact, there is a Cro-Magnon painting in Minateda, Spain, that shows a woman and a child clothed in dresses with styled hair! This is reprinted in *Art in the Ice-age: Spanish Levant Art, Arctic Art* by Hans-Georg Bandi and Johannes Maringer (New York: Praeger, 1953, p. 131), which I have in my library.

The Cro-Magnon people had highly developed culture. They cared for the sick and buried their dead with accompanying rituals.

From a biblical standpoint, none of this is surprising. God created man about 6,000 years ago and he was intelligent and skilled from his beginning. In fact, Adam and the early generations of men were doubtless more intelligent than men are today, after having suffered the deleterious effects of thousands of years of sin and divine curse. Adam's children built the first cities, practiced horticulture, raised livestock, worked with metals, and made musical instruments (Genesis 4).

It is probable that the child prodigy gives us a tiny glimpse into the potential that was inherent in our first parents and that has largely been lost.

Neanderthal

The first Neanderthal fossils were discovered by lime quarry workmen in a cave in the Neander Valley near Dusseldorf, Germany, in 1856.

Neanderthal means the valley of Neander; the *h* is silent. The old German spelling, *thal*, was changed to *tal* in 1901, and today both spellings are in use (*Neanderthal* and *Neandertal*).

The valley was named for Joachem Neander, a 17th-century Lutheran theologian and hymn writer. He had a custom of walking along the forested valley that later bore his name while composing and singing hymns to the glory of God. Melvin Lubenow observes, "... when Neander walked in his beautiful valley so many years ago, he could not know that hundreds of years later his name would become world famous, not for his hymns celebrating creation but for a concept that he would have totally rejected: human evolution" (Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, p. 85).

Since the 19th century, portions of more than 475 Neanderthal-type skeletons have been unearthed. These were

found mostly in Europe, though some were found in Africa and Asia. Typically they feature a large eyebrow ridge, low forehead, strong lower jaw, receding chin, and curved but heavily built leg bones.

At first, most scientists were of the opinion that the bones were merely ancient men. Richard Owen in England, the founder of the British Natural History Museum and an opponent of Darwinism, and Rudolf Virchow (1821-1902) in Germany, the founder of modern pathology, declared that the bones were human. Virchow concluded that the unique features of the skull (e.g., high eyebrow ridge and curved thighbone) were the products of childhood rickets and old age arthritis.

Ernst Haeckel, Darwin's disciple in Germany, helped spread the myth of Neanderthal as an ape-man. In 1907, Haeckel described Neanderthal as a pre-human and placed him between *Pithecanthropus* (Java man) and *Homo Australis*, which he called "the lowest race of recent man." This reflected Haeckel's racist view that the Australian aborigines represent the lowest stage in full human evolution. Haeckel misrepresented Neanderthal's brain capacity at 1270 cc, which is less than average for "modern man," when in reality Neanderthal's brain capacity was 1560 cc, which is much larger than average.

After the discovery in 1908 of a nearly complete Neanderthal skeleton in La Chapell-aux-Saints in France, French paleontologist Marcellin Boule (1861-1942) of the Museum of Natural History in Paris, added his authority to the evolutionary myth. Boule believed that Neanderthal was a branch of ape-men that became extinct without giving rise to modern humans. Between December 1908 and June 1909 Boule reported to the Academy of Sciences that Neanderthal was ape-like in many characteristics, including the skull and "a divergent great toe." He believed that Neanderthal did not walk erect like modern man but walked pigeon-toed like an ape with a bent-knee shuffling gait.

Boule said that Neanderthal “must have possessed only a rudimentary psychic nature ... only the most rudimentary articulate language” (*Fossil Men*, 1957, p. 251).

Others supposed that Neanderthal couldn’t speak, but only grunted like an animal.

Grafton Elliot Smith in England referred to Neanderthal as “uncouth and repellent.” He claimed that his nose “was not sharply separated from the face, but was more like a snout” (Michael Pitman, *Adam and Evolution*, p. 87).

In 1909, Frantisek Kupka drew a sketch of Neanderthal as a stooped, hairy ape-man with a club in his hand and a wild look on his ugly face. It was published in the *Illustrated London News*.

In 1919, H.G. Wells wrote, “[Neanderthal] stooped forward and could not hold his head erect, as all living men do; he was chinless and perhaps incapable of speech ... he was, indeed, not quite of the human species” (*The Outline of History*).

In 1930, Frederick Blaschke modeled a Neanderthal family in a cave setting, based on Boule’s interpretation. They were stooped, half-clothed, clutching bones, and had very stupid expressions. This was set up as a permanent display in the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago and was copied in countless textbooks, encyclopedias, journals, popular magazines and newspapers, and museums.

This is the view that prevailed for nearly half a century. It was not science; it was myth-making based on pure speculation.

The prevailing view ignored the fact that Neanderthal skeletons had been found together with tools and weapons, and there was evidence of a developed social culture. They buried their dead, used fire, constructed shelters, skinned animals.

The prevailing view also ignored the fact that there were “stone age” tribes of people in several parts of the world during the first half of the twentieth century that lived

primitive lives but were obviously fully human, so there was no compulsion to label Neanderthal as some sort of missing link or pre-human because of a “cave man” lifestyle. The fact is that the paleoanthropologists were blinded by their evolutionary zeal so that they saw what they wanted to see.

The prevailing view also ignored the fact--often pointed out by creationists and even by some evolutionists--that there are people living today who look like the so-called Neanderthals: short and stocky, heavy eyebrow ridges, etc. In fact, in 1910 a living specimen of a Neanderthal was found, “complete with the massive lower jaw, receding chin, heavy eyebrow ridges, small muscular frame, and short femur” (Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 211). The anatomist who carefully measured this individual also observed that the Tay Tay people of the Philippines display distinctive Neanderthal features (Taylor, p. 461). In fact, many Australian aboriginals look like “Neanderthals.”

The prevailing view also ignored the fact that the brow-ridges of Neanderthal are clearly human rather than ape-like. “In the case of the ape, the prominent orbital ridge over the eyes is the result of the thickening of the edge of the bone over the eye; in the case of all men, including the Neanderthal Man, the brow-ridges are the result of the uniting of two bones, one of which is joined to the nose and the other to the opposite side” (Patrick O’Connell, *Science of Today and the Problems of Genesis*, 1959, p. 94).

After a half century of parading the supposed cave-man Neanderthals before the world and misleading millions of people, some scientists gave the La Chapelle-aux-Saints Neanderthal bones a new inspection.

In 1957, W.L. Straus of Johns Hopkins University and A.J.E. Cave of St. Bartholomew’s Hospital Medical College determined that Boule had been wrong in some very fundamental matters. The Neanderthal’s toe and pelvis were not ape-like as Boule had claimed. The “Neanderthal” was fully human, after all.

Since the 1960s, a new view of Neanderthal has gradually emerged. Neanderthal has even been reclassified as *Homo sapiens neanderthalensis*, a type of modern man, though some evolutionists still hold to the old classification.

In 1970, Francis Ivanhoe, concluded that Neanderthal had suffered from rickets due to vitamin D deficiency (“Was Virchow Right about Neandertal?” *Nature*, Aug. 8, 1970).

In 1971, D.J.M. Wright of Guy’s Hospital Medical School in London also concluded that the Neanderthals suffered from disease, possibly including congenital syphilis. “In societies with poor nutrition, rickets and congenital syphilis frequently occur together” (“Syphilis and Neanderthal Man,” *Nature*, Feb. 5, 1971).

In 1978, Neanderthal expert Erik Trinkaus of the Washington University, St. Louis, wrote, “Detailed comparisons of Neanderthal skeletal remains with those of modern humans have shown that there is nothing in Neanderthal anatomy that conclusively indicates locomotor, manipulative, intellectual, or linguistic abilities inferior to those of modern humans” (“Hard Times among the Neanderthals,” *Natural History*, Dec. 1978).

In 1989, it was reported that a Neanderthal skeleton found at Kebara Cave, Mount Carmel, Israel, had a hyoid bone identical in size and shape to that of modern humans. This is a small bone at the base of the tongue that is important to speech and that is different in apes. An ape hyoid bone has a cup shape that contains resonating sacs that apes use to produce loud percussive noises. Anthropologists were “surprised” by this discovery (“The Hyoid Bone and the Capacity for Speech in Hominids and Apes,” *Minneapolis Newsvine*, May 14, 2008).

It is now admitted that Neanderthals had a sophisticated culture (cared for the sick and elderly, buried their dead, practiced religion), used a wide variety of tools, including bone and flint tools, hafted stone axes, used adhesive, attached points to wooden spears with leather thongs, made

bone awls or needles, built walled habitations, made hearths for cooking and warmth, made ornaments and figures out of bone, teeth, ivory, and polished wood, and even played flutes with the same seven-note musical system found in western music (Marvin Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, pp. 239-244, 254-257). Further, the Neanderthals were master hunters and defended themselves against powerful beasts including the woolly mammoth, giant cave bear, giant warthog, giant saber-toothed cat, rhinoceros, and elephant (Lubenow, p. 248).

More recent depictions of Neanderthal show him as human and more civilized, though many evolutionists cling to the myth that he does not represent “modern humanity” and is indeed a missing link of some sort.

The average person, who pays little or no attention to the constantly changing winds of evolutionary theories, doubtless still thinks of Neanderthal as the dumb cave man he has been depicted in mythical evolutionary artwork.

Have evolutionists loudly apologized for the error they perpetrated on the world? Not in the least. In fact, it was two full decades before the Chicago Field Museum corrected its influential but grossly misleading display. As Marvin Lubenow says, “It was not until the mid-1970s that the Field Museum removed their old display of the apish Neandertals and replaced them with the tall, erect Neandertals that are there today. What did they do with the old display? Did they throw it on the trash heap where it belonged? No. They moved the old display to the second floor and placed it right next to the huge Apatosaurus dinosaur skeleton where more people than ever--especially children--would see it. They labeled it ‘An alternative view of Neandertal.’ It was not an alternate view. It was a *wrong* view. So much for the self-correcting mechanism in science as far as Neandertal is concerned” (*Bones of Contention*, p. 55).

Does it matter? Yes, because for a large part of the 20th century Neanderthal was used as a major “evidence” for evolution, even though it was a deception all along.

“During the time that the mistakes went undetected, the ‘savage-caveman’ idea was being used worldwide as strong evidence for human evolution. The word *Neandertal* is still virtually synonymous with brute. Until recently, it would have been easy to find a children’s book in almost any schoolroom where a picture of Neandertal was displayed as one of the major evidences for human evolution. ... When it takes scientists forty-four years to correct very obvious mistakes, it is hardly fair to call that a successful case of self-correction” (Lubenow, p. 54).

Recent computerized forensic reconstructions show Neanderthals as normal humans.

“Bones cannot tell you about things like hairiness, nor the shape of the fleshy parts, like nose or ears. But computerized forensic science has come a long way in making educated ‘guesses’ at a person’s appearance from the shape of a skull. As reported in January 1996 *National Geographic*, researchers at the University of Illinois used computer ‘morphing’ techniques to fit pictures of living people onto Neanderthal’s skulls. Unlike the artistic reconstructions of earlier times, this time nothing was imaginatively added based on evolutionary assumptions of ‘primitivity’. **The results indicate that the bones of the skull would not preclude Neanderthals from looking like people you would not greatly comment on (apart from hair and dress style) if they moved in next door to you today**” (Michael Oard, “Neanderthal Man--the Changing Picture,” Feb. 17, 2004, Answers in Genesis).

It is now known that Neanderthals lived contemporaneously with “modern humans” (B. Bowers, “Neanderthals and Humans Each Get a Grip,” *Science News*, 2001, p. 84). In 1997, scientists rediscovered the original cave in the Neander Valley and found 36 more Neanderthal remains (some fitting the original Neanderthal fossil) as well as some “modern human” remains. The Neanderthal remains were radiocarbon dated to 40,000 years, but the modern humans were dated to 44,000 years (“Germans unearth hoard

of Neanderthal remains,” *Nature*, Sept. 7, 2000, cited from Lubenow, p. 85). The researchers also found thousands of stone tools, plus burnt and cut bones of animals. They concluded that “this is evidence of food preparation and cooking, indicating that the Neanderthals belong to a settlement.” Lubenow observes, “Thus the original Neanderthal fossils testify that the Neanderthals were contemporaries with modern humans and were fully modern culturally as well” (*Bones of Contention*, p. 85).

In January 2010, it was reported that painted, perforated shells have been found in Neanderthal sites in southern Spain. The jewelry, which likely adorned the necks of Neanderthals, features red, yellow, orange, and black pigments composed of “complex recipes.” The expedition, which was led by Professor Joao Zilhao of Bristol University in the UK, concluded that the find buries “the view of Neanderthals as half-wits” (“Neanderthal ‘Make-up’ Containers,” BBC News, Jan. 9, 2010). Some of the shells are also thought to have been containers for make-up.

Recent “ground-breaking research” into Neanderthal’s hyoid bone has concluded that “the Neanderthals may well have spoken in languages not dissimilar to the ones we use today” (“Talking Neanderthals Challenge the Origins of Speech,” *Science Daily*, Mar. 2, 2014). An international team of scientists using 3D x-ray imaging led by Stephen Wroe of the University of New England compared a “60,000 year-old Neanderthal hyoid bone” (the aforementioned one found in Israel) with those of “modern humans” and concluded “that in terms of mechanical behaviour, the Neanderthal hyoid was basically indistinguishable from our own, strongly suggesting that this key part of the vocal tract was used in the same way.”

An editorial in *The Guardian* said, “It seems we have all been guilty of defaming Neanderthal man” (“In Praise of ... Neanderthal Man,” Jan. 13, 2010).

Indeed.

The Neanderthal fossils probably represent people who existed in the centuries following the Flood and who still lived to be ancient by modern standards. In 1973, H. Israel demonstrated that heavy eyebrow ridges and an elongated cranial vault are characteristics of extreme age. Noah's son Shem lived 500 years after the Flood and died at 600 years old (Gen. 11:10-11). Shem's son Arphaxad lived 438 years, and his great grandson Peleg lived 239 years, so longevity exceeded modern standards, though it was gradually decreasing.

The case of Neanderthal refutes the doctrine of evolution and reminds us yet again that it does not deserve to be called a scientific theory or even a hypothesis.

Java Man

Java Man is the popular name for a few bones that were found on the island of Java in 1891-92 by Eugene Dubois, who was searching earnestly for and in complete faith that he would find Darwin's "missing link."

Dubois was a disciple of Ernst Haeckel, who had such faith in the evolution of man that he had already named the missing link *Pithecanthropus alalus* ("ape-man without speech"). So much for unbiased anthropological diggings!

In fact, Haeckel had already commissioned a picture of the ape-man from artist Gabriel Max. The ridiculous drawing depicted a pot-bellied, mustachioed, semi-ape-faced man with his female companion sitting cross-legged, suckling an infant. Both wear an exceedingly dumb expression and the ape-woman has ape-like large toes.

When Dubois set out on his journey, there was no fossil evidence for the evolution of man, and evolutionists earnestly desired to find such evidence to confound their critics.

"In this crucial time for the Darwin followers, there was no actual fossil evidence of this or any other transition, and in the contest between academy and pulpit, this was

acknowledged to be one of the great weaknesses of Darwin's theory" (Ian Taylor, *In the Mind of Men*, p. 217).

Dubois' team of prison convicts found an apelike skullcap in 1891 and the next year he found a human thighbone 50 feet away. On this slim and dubious evidence (who could even say that the bones belong to the same individual), after conferring with Haeckel, Dubois announced the discovery of a creature that was "admirably suited to the role of missing link." He and Haeckel had found the ape-man of their evolutionary dreams. They saw what they wanted to see.

Haeckel had a life-size model made of the mythical creature and exhibited it in museums throughout Europe. It still stands in the basement of the Leiden Natural History Museum (Milton, *Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, p. 198).

Java Man appeared in countless publications as a premier evidence for evolution. It was hugely influential, but it was also a huge deception.

"People talked of Pithecanthropus as of Pitt or Fox or Napoleon. Popular histories published portraits of him like the portraits of Charles I or George IV. No uninformed person, looking at its carefully lined face, would imagine for a moment that this was the portrait of a thigh bone, of a few teeth, and fragment of a cranium" (G. K. Chesterton, quoted from Francis Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe*, p. 180).

Since evolutionists often hide or downplay evidence that doesn't fit their doctrine, it is not surprising that an essential piece of information was kept secret by Dubois for a third of a century. Two "modern" human skulls were discovered near the location of the Java Man fossils in 1888 and 1890. The first was found by a Dutch mining engineer who sent it to Dubois in Germany. The second was found by Dubois after he arrived in Java. Dubbed Wadjak I and Wadjak II for the name of a nearby village, these skulls have the cranial capacity of 1550 cc and 1650 cc, more than half again the size of "Java Man." Dubois petulantly withheld this important

information from the public for thirty years, finally making the announcement in May 1920. (He had mentioned the skulls in his reports to an obscure department of the Dutch East Indies government, but such bureaucratic reports were not intended for the public and indeed were not made public.) Even in 1920, Dubois only revealed the information to thwart fellow evolutionist Stuart A. Smith's claim to have found the first "proto-Australian."

"... if Dubois had revealed the Wadjak fossils at the time he revealed *Pithecanthropus*, his beloved *Pithecanthropus* would never have been accepted as the missing link. Dubois was well aware of that fact. There is evidence that Wadjak was approximately the same age as *Pithecanthropus*, so to sell *Pithecanthropus*, Dubois had to hide Wadjak" (Melvin Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, p. 100).

This, my friends, is deceit and there is nothing "scientific" about it.

When Dubois returned to Europe in 1895 and displayed his fossils at the International Congress of Zoology at Leyden, authorities greeted the announcement "with considerable skepticism and divided opinion" (Gish, p. 281).

Because of the lack of initial support from the scientific community, Dubois became "irascible and secretive," gave up medicine and fossil hunting, and refused to let anyone even look at his meager collection of "*Pithecanthropus erectus*" bones. When the Berlin Academy of Science sponsored an expedition to Java in 1907 to do further exploration at the site where "Java Man" had been discovered, Dubois refused to cooperate or even to allow the scientists to see his fossils (Ian Taylor, p. 220). Dubois displayed the same petty selfishness that many other paleoanthropologists have since exhibited. G.H.R. von Koenigswald said of him: "On this point he was as unaccountable as a jealous lover. Anyone who disagreed with his interpretation of *Pithecanthropus* was his personal enemy" (*Meeting Prehistoric Man*, p. 32).

In spite of the flimsy evidence and the lack of consensus about the nature of the discovery, the print media spread the news far and wide. Pictures were drawn depicting Dubois' ape-man. The mythical Java Man appeared in museums. Based only on a skull cap, a couple of teeth, and a thigh bone (found, it will be recalled, in different locations and without evidence that they belonged to the same individual), scientists even argued that the creature walked upright.

In 1907, the aforementioned German expedition led by Professor M. Lenore Selenka traveled to Java to do more research into Java Man. This was a large expedition that included Professor Max Blanckenhorn and 17 other specialists, with funding from the Berlin Academy of Science. They removed more than 10,000 cubic meters of material in the search for more remains of *Pithecanthropus*, but no fossils were found. In 1911, they published a 342-page report which "suffered the fate decreed for all evidence that is contrary to evolution: consignment to the lower reaches of oblivion. ... With one exception, the newer works on paleoanthropology ignore the Selenka report completely. ... It is an amazing conspiracy of silence" (Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, pp. 110, 113). A copy of the report was finally located by British creationist A. G. Tilney after he had searched over 60 libraries in Europe. Before his death in 1976 he published portions of it in a pamphlet entitled *Pithecanthropus: The Facts*. It was also reviewed by Arthur Keith in "The Problem of *Pithecanthropus*" (*Nature*, July 13, 1911).

The expedition determined that Dubois had seriously overestimated the age of the stratum in which *Pithecanthropus* was found. They discovered that a nearby volcano had caused periodic flooding and that the Java Man fossils were found in volcanic sediments. The scientists concluded that these sediments, and not ancient age, had caused the fossilization of Dubois' bones. In the same stratum they found foundations of hearths and pieces of wood

charcoal. Though the expedition's scientists were all evolutionists and its purpose was to confirm Dubois' findings, they were honest enough to arrive at a different conclusion based on the evidence. "Frau Selenka, the leader of this exemplary expedition, concluded that modern humans and *Pithecanthropus* both had lived at the same time and that *Pithecanthropus* played no part in human evolution" (*Bones of Contention*, p. 112).

Other scientists reached the same conclusion about Java Man. Dr. Rudolph Virchow, director of the Berlin Society for Anthropology and the father of modern pathology, believed the skull was that of an ape, while the thigh bone was that of a man. He wrote, "The skull has a deep suture between the low vault and the upper edge of the orbits. Such a suture is found only in apes, not in man. Thus the skull must belong to an ape. In my opinion this creature was an animal, a giant gibbon in fact. The thigh bone has not the slightest connection with the skull" (H. Wendt, *From Ape to Adam*, 1972, pp. 167, 168).

Dr. Marcellin Boule, one of the world's foremost experts in human fossils, and H. V. Vallois, Boule's successor as director of the French Institute of Human Paleontology, also argued that the skull was that of an ape. In the book *Fossil Men*, they wrote, "*Pithecanthropus*, discovered in the same zoological region as the modern gibbons, may have been no more than a particularly large representative of a genus more or less closely allied to the same group" (p. 126).

Boule and Vallois concluded that if you only looked at the *Pithecanthropus* skull you would say, "ape," but if you only looked at the thighbone, you would say, "man." The obvious answer to the problem is that the skull was that of an ape, while the thighbone, that of a man. No evidence has ever been offered that would prove that the two bones belong to the same individual, other than the fact that they were found within 50 feet of one another, which is no evidence at all.

It is said that before he died Dubois stated that the Java Man skull belonged to a giant gibbon. What he said was that it represented a large ape of “gibbon-like appearance,” but he still believed it was a missing link. Melvin Lubenow says, “... to the end of his life Dubois ‘kept the faith,’ believing that his beloved *Pithecanthropus* was uniquely *the* missing link” (p. 97).

In 1950, *Pithecanthropus erectus* was reclassified *HOMO ERECTUS*. It shares this category with nearly 300 other fossil individuals that have been discovered subsequently.

In spite of its shady character and the clear scientific evidence against it, Java Man has continued to be used as an example of human evolution from apes. Lubenow observes:

“One of the most amazing facets of the Java Man saga is this: Throughout the twentieth century, the skullcap and the femur were presented to the public together as Java Man, our evolutionary ancestor, by evolutionists. Yet the association of the skullcap with the femur has always been questioned by the most respected evolutionary anatomists from the time of Java Man’s discovery until today. It is just one of the many illustrations of the fact that evolutionists will use whatever ‘proof’ to sell evolution to the general public, regardless of its scientific authenticity” (*Bones of Contention*, p. 96).

Piltdown Man

Piltdown Man was held forth as a missing link in human evolution for 40 years, but it turned out to be a complete hoax.

In 1912, amateur naturalist Charles Dawson told the Geological Society of London that over the previous four years fragments of a skull, half of a lower jawbone, and a tooth had been found at the Piltdown gravel pit in Sussex. Dawson had been accompanied on some of his excavations by Arthur Smith Woodward, keeper of the geological department at the British Natural History Museum and the world’s leading expert on fossil fish, and by Pierre Teilhard de

Chardin, Jesuit priest and New Age mystic. It was Teilhard who found another tooth at the Piltdown site in August 1913.

Eventually the esteemed scientific team examining the bones included Arthur Keith, professor of anatomy at the Royal College of Surgeons, and Grafton Elliot Smith, a renowned brain specialist. (In 1922, Smith collaborated with an artist to produce the likeness of “Nebraska Man” in the *Illustrated London News*. This particular missing link turned out to be fossilized pig.)

Piltdown Man was given the scientific name of *Eoanthropus dawsoni* (“Dawson’s dawn-man”) in honor of its discoverer.

The hoax was not even an accomplished one and should have been obvious from the beginning even to amateurs. “The file marks on the orangutan teeth of the lower jaw were clearly visible. The molars were misaligned and filed at two different angles. The canine tooth had been filed down so far that the pulp cavity had been exposed and then plugged” (Marvin Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, p. 58). Further, the teeth were not even stained; they were painted with brown paint (John Walsh, *Unravelling Piltdown*, p. 69, 70). And they were not even uniformly colored; one was much darker than the others (Walsh, p. 45).

Piltdown’s discoverers even found an elephant bone carved in the appearance of a small cricket bat. What more evidence would you need to prove that the British evolved from apes, when their ape-men ancestors obviously loved cricket! It appears that whoever perpetrated the hoax was trying to end the thing with this silly concoction, but the evolutionists were so gullible, they so terribly wanted to see an ape-man fossil, that they fell for the thing, hook, line, and sinker--filed teeth, misaligned molars, plugged cavities, cricket bat, and all.

Upon discovery of the “fossils,” *The New York Times* ran a headline, “Darwin Theory Proved True.” The subtitle screamed, “English Scientists say the skull found in Sussex establishes human descent from apes.”

Drawings, paintings, and statues of Piltdown began to proliferate. The one by Louis Rutot, titled *Man of Sussex*, depicted Piltdown as an ape-man (a half-ape, half-human head on a hairy human body) making a crude tool.

A plaster reconstruction was given a prominent place in the British Museum of Natural History, where it sat for the next 41 years, providing striking evidence to countless visitors, including multitudes of children, of the truth of human evolution.

That was at the dawn of the age of skepticism described in 2 Peter 3:3-7, and since then all of the major secular publications of the world have set themselves to tear down the authority of Almighty God and to discredit His holy Word. Every new “scientific discovery,” regardless of how questionable, has been announced to the world as “proof” that the Bible is not true and that man is an evolved animal.

Though there were holdouts, in the scientific community, in general Piltdown Man was accepted as a genuine missing link and adopted into textbooks, described in encyclopedias, represented at museums, and discussed in hundreds of articles and scientific papers.

“Evolutionists now like to boast that not everyone accepted Piltdown. Technically they are correct. There were a few, such as Weidenreich and Hrdlicka, who did not accept Piltdown. But the vast majority of paleoanthropologists worldwide did accept Piltdown as legitimate, especially after the confirming discoveries at Piltdown II” (Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, p. 56).

“Young scientists and old alike wasted untold thousands of hours on the Piltdown phenomenon. The laborious study, and the writing and publishing of the several hundred research reports and papers worldwide, the sheer, enormous amount of space in books and articles given to sober discussion of its every smallest aspect, make a picture sad to contemplate” (John Walsh, *Unravelling Piltdown*, p. xvi).

Piltdown was used to silence Bible believers the world over.

“Needless to say, objections to man’s ape ancestry made in the pulpit were effectively silenced. A whole generation grew up with Piltdown Man in their textbooks and home encyclopedias; who in their right mind would question the veracity of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*?” (Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 224).

It is also true that countless people retained their confidence in the Bible as God’s infallible Word throughout the first half of the twentieth century in spite of such “evidence” for evolution as Piltdown, and they have been vindicated.

At the Scopes Trial in 1925, lawyer Clarence Darrow used Piltdown as evidence for evolution through testimony introduced by his “expert” witnesses: Professor Fay-Cooper Cole and Professor Horatio Newman (professors at the University of Chicago). Judge Raulston allowed their testimonies to be read into the court record.

Piltdown was treated enthusiastically by British paleontologists. The British Museum of Natural History, which was the keeper of the bones, was completely duped.

Arthur Smith Woodward published a book about Piltdown entitled *The Earliest Englishman* (1948). Woodward even devoted a chapter to “The Everyday Life of Piltdown Man.” Waxing eloquent about this mythical creature, Woodward said Piltdown walked in a shuffling gait, lived in caves, cooked on fires, boiled water, carried his water in leather bladders, and ate meat from animals he caught in snares and pits, supplementing his diet with roots, nuts, and seeds. Piltdown dressed in skins with “the fur turned inside, made leather thongs for various purposes, and buried his dead.” One thing you must give these evolutionists: they have incredible imaginations! No wonder that many of them have been at the forefront of science fiction.

Piltdown wasn’t the first hoax that Woodward fell for. In 1914 he had been duped by a schoolboy prank. Some boys

scratched a crude drawing of a horse's head and forequarters on a piece of bone and had it sent to the Natural History Museum for inspection. Woodward excitedly announced in the journal of the Geological Society that it was a rare example of "the pictorial art of Palaeolithic man." After Woodward's retirement, leading paleontologist William Sollas of Oxford University stated in his book *Ancient Hunters* that the bone was "a forgery perpetrated by some schoolboys." Woodward was also involved in the "Rhodesian Man" fiasco. A skull and bones found in 1921 by zinc miners in British Northern Rhodesia were pronounced by Woodward to be another "missing link." He and W. J. Pycraft determined that the Rhodesian man walked in ape-man fashion and initially named it *Cyphanthropus* or "stooping man." Eventually, though, it was determined to be a "modern man" that walked perfectly upright and was renamed *Homo rhodesiensis*.

Piltdown played a significant role in "proving" Darwinian evolution in England and beyond during the first half of the twentieth century, and its discoverers were rewarded generously. Arthur Keith, Arthur Woodward, and Grafton Elliot Smith were knighted by the Queen. Woodward, who called Piltdown "the most important thing that ever happened in my life," was awarded the Royal Society's Gold Medal, the Lyell Medal, the Linnean Medal, the Wollaston Prize, the French Academy's Prix Cuvier, and the American Museum's Thompson Medal. In 1915 an oil painting of Smith, Woodward, and Keith was hung in the Royal Institution to honor the fathers of the famous Piltdown.

So many evolutionary scientists accepted this fraud because it "admirably satisfied the theoretical expectations of the time" (Richard Harter, "Piltdown Man," 1996, http://home.tiac.net/~cri_a/piltdown/piltdown.html). It fit the evolutionary conception of what the "missing link" would look like: a creature that was evolving from apedome by means of his rapidly increasing brain power. "A big-brained

ancestor was what evolutionists expected to find. Sir Grafton Elliott Smith had predicted that a fossil very similar to Piltdown would be found” (Marvin Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, p. 58).

Like Percival Lowell who saw canals on Mars, the paleontologists who accepted Piltdown saw what they wanted to see.

In 1915, a challenge to Piltdown appeared in the form of a lengthy scientific study by anthropologist Gerrit Miller of the Smithsonian Institute. He painstakingly compared the Piltdown jaw to the jaws of more than 100 apes and concluded that the Piltdown jaw could not possibly fit the skull. Like many others who have been brave enough to speak out against evolutionary icons, Miller was treated roughly by Woodward and others at the British Museum. Zoologist William Pycraft gave a public reply to Miller that consisted “largely of personal abuse” (Walsh, p. 52). This is how naysayers are treated by evolutionists to this very day.

In 1923, anatomist Franz Weidenreich (promoter of the Peking Man myth) voiced his opinion that the jawbone was that of an orangutan with filed-down teeth, but these concerns were ignored for another 30 years.

In 1953, the British Museum ran a chemical fluorine test on the Piltdown fossils and discovered that they were modern. In November of that year, the London *Times* published evidence that Piltdown’s skull was actually a composite of a 500-year-old human skull, the lower jaw of an orangutan, and the tooth of a chimpanzee. The aging had been created by staining the bones with an iron solution and with brown paint. The teeth had been filed to fit and to show wear and had been patched with gum. It was also found that one of the teeth was an elephant molar and another was from a hippopotamus (Walsh, p. 75).

The bad news was delivered to Sir Arthur Keith not long before his death. His book, *The Antiquity of Man*, first published in 1916, had focused on Piltdown, treating it as the

missing link. In his autobiography, Keith described how that he rejected the Bible and the gospel of Jesus Christ on the basis of evolution. Keith attended evangelistic meetings and was on the verge of converting to Christ, but he drew back because he believed that the Genesis account of creation had been proven to be a myth (Lubenow, p. 59). In reality, Keith gambled his eternal soul on evolutionary myths.

Who perpetrated the Piltdown fraud? Many books and articles have been written to express an opinion on this interesting question. Candidates include Dawson, Keith, Smith, Woodward, Teilhard, Martin Hinton, even Arthur Conan Doyle (creator of Sherlock Holmes). It appears that Charles Dawson is the likely candidate, though he might not have acted alone. He was the “discoverer” of most of the fossils, and he had a history of faking fossils and of plagiarism, as John Walsh documents in his book *Unravelling Piltdown*. Walsh says, “During the final decade of the nineteenth century, Dawson perpetrated half a dozen or more frauds, none quite as elaborate as Beauport, but all in their own way ingenious” (p. 178).

It is possible that Jesuit priest Pierre Teilhard also had a part in the scheme.

“On 29 August 1913 Teilhard stayed overnight with Dawson and went next day with him and Woodward to the Piltdown pit. Lo! There appeared one of the two missing canine teeth. Arthur Smith Woodward reported that they excavated a deep trench in which Father Teilhard was especially energetic. When he exclaimed that he had picked up a canine tooth, the others were incredulous, telling him that they had already seen bits of ironstone that looked like teeth on the spot where he stood, but Teilhard insisted that he was not deceived. They left their digging to verify his discovery; there could be no doubt about it--Teilhard had found a canine from the previously discovered jaw” (Michael Pitman, *Adam and Evolution*, p. 92).

The greater fraud was committed not only by the British Museum and the larger evolutionary scientific community but also by all of the anti-God publications that rushed to announce that evidence disproving the Bible had been discovered.

“The museum’s partners in fraud include everyone within the scientific community who trumpeted these finds without challenging the evidence. So eager were they all to validate Darwin and the naturalist worldview that they closed their eyes to the obvious” (Jack Cashill, *Hoodwinked: How Intellectual Hucksters Have Hijacked American Culture*, p. 183).

Louis Leakey, in his book *Adam’s Ancestors*, testified that on each occasion that he visited the British Museum to do research on Piltdown, he was given the original fossils for just a few moments and then given casts to work on. But it turned out that the casts did not have the file marks on the teeth that were visible on the originals. Also, the evidence of staining, painting, patching, and other modifications would not have been evident on the casts.

Nebraska Man

In 1922, Henry Osborn, president of the American Museum of Natural History in New York City, announced the discovery of a new missing link between apes and man based on a fossilized tooth discovered in Nebraska five years earlier by rancher Harold Cook. Osborn doubtless wanted a North American apeman to compete with England’s Piltdown.

Joining Osborn in the conclusion that a new apeman had been discovered were William Gregory (museum curator) and Milo Hellman, who were regarded as two of the world’s leading authorities on the teeth of primates. They concluded, “On the whole, we think its nearest resemblances are with ‘Pithecanthropus’ [Java Man] and with men rather than with apes” (*Museum novitates*, no. 27).

Osborn named the missing link *Hesperopithecus haroldcookii*, to honor the rancher who discovered the tooth (*Herperopithecus* means “ape of the western world”).

In an article for *The Forum*, May 1925, Osborn said, “What shall we do with the Nebraska tooth? ... Certainly we shall not banish this bit of Truth because it does not fit in with our preconceived notions and because at present IT CONSTITUTES INFINITESIMAL BUT IRREFUTABLE EVIDENCE THAT THE MAN-APE WANDERED OVER FROM ASIA INTO NORTH AMERICA.”

On June 24, 1922, the popular and influential *Illustrated London News* published a two-page black and white drawing of “Nebraska Man” based on collaboration with evolutionist Grafton Elliot Smith, who joined Osborn in the belief that the tooth was that of an ape-man. Smith, an anatomist, was the leading specialist on the evolution of the brain, but he was very gullible. He had fallen hook-line-and-sinker for the Piltdown hoax. The text of the article accompanying the Nebraska Man drawing was written by Smith, who stated, “Mr. Forestier [the artist] has made a remarkable sketch to convey some idea of the possibilities suggested by this discovery. ... if, as the peculiarities of the tooth suggest, *Hesperopithecus* was a primitive forerunner of *Pithecanthropus*, he may have been a creature such as Mr. Forestier has depicted.”

The language was tentative, no doubt, but even to pretend that a single well-worn tooth holds the possibility of being a missing link is ridiculous. The drawing depicted Mr. and Mrs. Nebraska Man. They are stooped and naked, human in body but somewhat apelike in the face. The brutish ape-man holds a club while his “wife” holds some small animal while looking at the male with a very stupid expression on her apish face.

Though both Osborn and some of Smith’s colleagues at the British Museum described the drawing as inaccurate and “of no scientific value,” their opinions were not blazoned to the public like the mythical drawing was, and no public

repentance was later made. Evolutionist art has influenced far more people to believe their myths than evolution's scientific reports. Forestier's imaginary artwork, beginning with Piltdown, appeared in the *Illustrated London News* and other publications for the first three decades of the twentieth century and influenced countless people.

Osborn used the Nebraska Man in his anti-fundamentalist newspaper articles and radio broadcasts to tear down faith in the Genesis record (Phillip Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, p. 5).

In his 1925 book *The Earth Speaks to Bryan*, Osborn mocked the fundamentalist leader William Jennings Bryan:

“... the Earth spoke to Bryan from his own State of Nebraska, in the message of a diminutive tooth, the herald of our knowledge of anthropoid apes in America. The *Hesperopithecus* tooth is like the ‘still small voice’; its sound is by no means easy to hear. ... this little tooth speaks volumes of truth--truth consistent with all we have known before” (p. 40).

That same year, at the Scopes Trial, both Nebraska Man and Piltdown were used as evidence to bolster the “theory” of evolution. According to the *New York Times*, June 26, 1925, Henry Osborn was one of the “eleven scientists” that were scheduled to testify in defense of the evolutionist John Scopes (though they did not actually appear at the trial). Osborn already hated Bryan, the special prosecutor in the case. In 1922, Osborn had joked that Nebraska Man might better be named *Bryopithecus* “after the most distinguished Primate which the State of Nebraska has thus far produced” (“The Scopes Monkey Trial,” <http://www.bradburyac.mistral.co.uk/tenness1.html>). Nebraska Man and Piltdown were mentioned at the trial in affidavits by “expert witnesses” Fay-Cooper Cole and Horatio Newman (professors at the University of Chicago), and Judge Raulston allowed their reports to be read into the court record.

Francis Hitching observes:

“So the trial that became a turning point in U.S. educational history, not to be significantly challenged for the next half-century, was steered toward its verdict by a pig tooth ... and an outright fake exhibit whose perpetrator is still not known” (*The Neck of the Giraffe*, p. 182).

Osborn’s animosity toward creationists continued to be expressed in his 1926 book *Evolution and Religion in Education: Polemics of the Fundamentalist Controversy of 1922 to 1926* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons).

In his 1927 book *The Evolution of Man*, Smith was still proposing that the tooth represented Nebraska Man, though he was now expressing some doubt. He said, “I think the balance of probability is in favour of the view that the tooth found in the Pliocene beds of Nebraska may possibly have belonged to a primitive member of the Human Family.”

Further field work in Nebraska determined that the tooth was actually that of an extinct pig called *Prosthennops*. In late 1927, Osborn’s colleague William King Gregory, who had joined Osborn in tentatively identifying the tooth as that of a missing link, published a short article in the *Science* journal with the title “*Hesperopithecus* Apparently not an Ape nor a Man.” On February 20, 1928, *The New York Times* ran the headline “Nebraska Ape Tooth Proved a Wild Pig’s.” The next day the *Times* of London reported “*Hesperopithecus* Dethroned.”

In the early 1970s, the “extinct” *Prosthennops* was found to be alive and well in Paraguay (Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 229).

Evolutionists who try to debunk the Nebraska Man episode as insignificant and criticize creationists for making an issue of it, point to the fact that Nebraska Man was never widely accepted and was rejected by the evolutionary community within a few years. This is true. The two-volume *Human Origins*, published in 1924, stated that “the teeth are not well preserved, so that the validity of Osborn’s

determination has not yet been generally accepted.” What these evolutionary apologists do not emphasize properly, though, is the fact that the head of the American Museum of Natural History, one of the most august scientific institutions, joined by his most learned colleagues, rushed to name an entirely new species from a mere worn tooth. They announced the new “missing link” to the world, and they and other scientists used this “evidence” in a court of law in one of most famous trials in history to debunk the Bible and deride Bible believers. A public apology should have been printed in a full-page ad in the leading publications of the land and announced prominently on radio, but they issued no such apology. Instead of trying to find some way to criticize creationists through this mess, evolutionists today should be humbly apologizing for the damage done to the Bible cause by the fiasco that was perpetrated by their forefathers.

Osborn so hated the Creator God of the Bible and the famous fundamentalist William Jennings Bryan and was so eager to find a missing link from Bryan’s own home state that he merely saw what he wanted to see.

Another motive in his rush to proclaim a missing link could have been Osborn’s evolutionary racism. In 1926, Osborn wrote:

“The Negroid stock is even more ancient than the Caucasian and Mongolian, as may be proved by an examination not only of the brain, of the hair, of the bodily characters, such as the teeth, the genitalia, the sense organs, but of the instincts, the intelligence. The standard intelligence of the average adult Negro is similar to that of the eleven-year-old youth of the species *Homo sapiens*” (“The Evolution of Human Races,” *Natural History*, Jan.-Feb. 1926).

Osborn was prominent in the eugenics movement, which was dedicated to the development of “a new and improved race of men.” Osborn was the president of the Second

International Congress of Eugenics in 1921. He praised the work of racists Jon Mjøen and Hermann Lundborg for giving men “a new appreciation of the spiritual, moral and physical value of the Nordic race” (Edwin Black, *War Against the Weak: Eugenics and America’s Campaign to Create a Master Race*, p. 244).

Henry Osborn was a true son of Percival Lowell. He saw non-existent things that he wanted to see.

The Taung Child: *Australopithecus Africanus*

In 1924, Raymond Dart obtained a fossil skull that had been blasted out of a limestone quarry in Taung, South Africa, near Johannesburg. He named it *Australopithecus africanus* (“southern ape from Africa”). Because it was the skull of a child, it was dubbed the “Taung Child.” Though it appears to be the skull of an ape and its brain was the size of an ape’s, Dart claimed that he could discern that its brain represented a stage toward human. The evidence for this, though, existed only in his mind.

Dart claimed that *Australopithecus africanus* made fire and used tools. He described the creature as an ape-man cannibal that “seized living quarries by violence, battered them to death, tore apart their broken bodies, dismembered them limb from limb, slaking their ravenous thirst with the hot blood of victims and greedily devouring livid writhing flesh.”

This wild-eyed hypothesis was disproved by the extensive research of Charles Brain. He showed that the “bone tools” were actually produced by wild animals as they devoured their prey and the “fire” was the residue of the dynamite used to blast the fossils out of the limestone. As Jeffrey McKee observes:

“Little or no evidence remained at Makapansgat of early human tool culture, and visions of our horrific cannibalistic past faded. As Brain noted in such elegant and simple language, our [supposed] ancestors were the hunted rather than the hunters” (Jeffrey McKee, *The*

Riddled Chain: Chance, Coincidence, and Chaos in Human Evolution, p. 64).

In 1973, the cave where the Taung fossil was found was dated by the latest evolutionary methods by geologist T.C. Partridge and found to be no older than three-quarters of a million years. Since evolutionists date true humans to that same time period, even by their own bogus dating methods and principles it is impossible for Taung to be a “missing link.”

In spite of the confusion, Taung has been nearly universally accepted in evolutionary circles as a step in human evolution. “By 1960, it would have been difficult to find any public-school book touching on human origins that did not have in it a picture of the Taung skull. That popularity has remained. The fossil received much publicity in 1984, the sixtieth anniversary of its discovery. Pictures of Taung are still found in most books dealing with human origins” (Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, p. 64).

Since the discovery of Taung, many other fossils have been assigned to the category *Australopithecus africanus*. Yet even the evolutionary textbooks admit that there are more questions about Taung in particular and *Australopithecus africanus* in general than there are answers. “... today the relationship of *A. africanus* to other hominids is intensely debated” (Charles Lockwood, *The Human Story*, p 45).

Solly Zuckerman, head of the Department of Anatomy of the University of Birmingham in England, studied *Australopithecus* fossils in great detail for 15 years. He and his team painstakingly compared the *Australopithecus* fossils with the bones of hundreds of humans and apes. In his 1978 autobiography *From Apes to Warlords*, Zuckerman said:

“I am still convinced that ... the claims that the Australopithecines of the Taung’s variety were missing links in the direct line of man’s descent, and creatures which walked and ran upright, and coursed wild animals

across the plains with the help of primitive weapons, are no more than speculation” (p. 62).

Regarding the Taung skull itself, Zuckerman said:

“The claims that are made about the human character of the australopithecine face and jaws are no more convincing than those made about the size of its brain. The australopithecine skull is in fact so overwhelmingly simian as opposed to human that the contrary proposition could be equated to an assertion that black is white” (*Beyond the Ivory Tower*, p. 78).

Much has been made of the fact that on the Taung fossil the foramen magnum, where the spinal column enters the skull, is more in the center as with humans (thus balancing the head on the spinal column) than toward the rear as with apes. But in 1957, J. Biegert concluded that “the position of the foramen magnum is independent of the nature of a Primate’s posture and locomotion” (quoted from Zuckerman, *Beyond the Ivory Tower*, p. 82).

Plesianthropus (Mrs. Ples)

When Raymond Dart announced that he had found the missing link in 1925, most scientists rejected his view and considered the fossil a mere ape. Robert Broom, a paleontologist at the Transvaal Museum in Pretoria, set out to correct that by locating an adult of the same species in the Taung limestone quarry.

In 1936, he found fragments of a skull which he dubbed *Plesianthropus* (“almost human”). Eleven years later, he found a nearly complete skull in the same vicinity that he dubbed Mrs. Ples, “assuming that it represented an old woman of the *Plesianthropus* kind.”

Subsequent research has found that the individual was a young male rather than an old woman.

Still, we are confidently told by evolutionists that “the skull strongly supports the view that this species was a bipedal hominid with a relatively small brain, distantly related to

Homo sapiens” (Francis Thackeray, “The Cradle of Humankind,” *Essence of a Land: South Africa and Its world Heritage Sites*, 2006).

The scientific problems with this view are manifold and devastating. First, we don’t know that the skull called “Taung Child” is the same type of creature as “Mrs Ples.” Second, it is not possible to tell for certain if a creature walked upright after a human fashion from a mere portion of a skull. Third, there is zero evidence that this creature was in any sense related to *Homo sapiens*. It is mere assumption based on evolutionary expectations.

In spite of the complete lack of evidence that *Plesianthropus* is in any way related to man, influential natural history museums such as the Museum of Man in San Diego present this myth as science and feature fanciful reconstructions of Mrs. Ples.

Peking Man

The fossils that became known as Peking Man were discovered near Peking (now Beijing), China, in the 1920s and 1930s. Like Java Man, Peking Man is based on a mixture of ape and human fossils.

Dr. Duane Gish says that the case of Peking Man reveals “a tangled web of contradictions, highly subjective treatment of the data, a peculiar and unnatural state of the fossil bones, and the loss of essentially all of the fossil material. ... If the type of evidence we have today relating to Peking Man were brought into a court of law, it would be ruled as hearsay and inadmissible as evidence” (*The Fossils Still Say No*, pp. 287, 288).

Patrick O’Connell, who published *Science of Today and the Problems of Genesis* in 1959, provided extensive evidence that Peking Man was a forgery. He lived in China during the period in question and had access to all relevant accounts in Chinese, French, German, and English. As a Catholic priest he had important background information on the

evolutionary priest Teilhard de Chardin. O'Connell concluded, "... there is available on the case of the Peking Man a mass of evidence that makes possible a solution quite as definite as that found for the Piltdown Man, and which proves that the *Sinanthropus* or Peking Man, in the sense of being a man in the process of evolution, is just another forgery" (*Science of Today*, 2nd edition, p. 109). O'Connell's voice was drowned out by the end-times stampede to authenticate Darwinian evolution and to discredit the Bible.

In 1921, Otto Zdansky began an excavation at a quarry about 25 miles from Peking known as Chou K'ou Tien ("dragon bone hill"). Today it is called Zhoukoudian. From this quarry, many "dragon bones" have been unearthed for use in Chinese home remedies. Zdansky's expedition was funded by multimillionaire Ivar Krueger, known in the 1920s as the "Match King" for garnering two-thirds of the world's match production. Krueger was not only a crook on a grand scale, he was an enthusiastic promoter of evolution. He funded the journal *Paleontologia Sinica*, which reported on findings relating to human origins in China. As Ian Taylor observes, "There was evidently high expectation that such evidence would be found" (*In the Minds of Men*, p. 230). (At the height of his financial empire, Krueger was worth 30 billion Swedish kronors or the equivalent of US \$100 billion today; the total annual loans made by Swedish banks then was only four billion kronor. His empire collapsed in the Great Depression when his financial dealings were exposed as a gigantic pyramid scheme. He committed suicide with a handgun in 1932.)

After finding two human-like teeth, Zdansky went back to Sweden. Later that year Johan Andersson and Walter Granger began an anthropological dig in Zhoukoudian. Before they even began digging, Andersson told his partner, "Here is primitive man; now all we have to do is find him" ("The First Knock at the Door," Peking Man Site Museum). So much for the vaunted unbiased scientific research! These men were not

digging for science; they were digging to prove their religion, and they discovered what they wanted to discover.

One tooth was found that year, and based on this incredibly flimsy evidence Canadian anatomist Davidson Black of Peking's Union Medical College announced that they had discovered a new species named *Sinanthropus pekinensis*. He considered it the most primitive "hominid" yet discovered. (In from *Adam to Evolution*, Michael Pitman says that Black had been an eager visitor to Piltdown.)

Black, who had been greatly influenced by William Matthew's book *Climate and Evolution*, was committed to the evolutionary "theory" and wanted to find evidence in the fossil record. His motive in taking a position at the Union Medical College was to explore that region for ancient human remains or missing links.

Another important figure in the Peking Man discovery was Teilhard de Chardin (1881-1955), who was also involved in the discovery of the Piltdown fossils in England, which turned out to be a hoax. Teilhard, a Jesuit priest, had been "banished to China" by the ecclesiastical authorities for holding to evolution and other doctrines unacceptable to Rome in that day. Since then his views have wielded a vast influence, as we document in the book *The New Age Tower of Babel*. His views on evolution were influenced through studies at the Museum of Natural History in Paris and by evolutionists Henri Bergson and Theodosius Dobzhansky. Teilhard also studied under Marcellin Boule, the French professor who promoted *Neanderthal* as a dumb cave man. *The New York Times* for March 19, 1937, described Teilhard as *the Jesuit who held that man descended from monkeys*. Because he was forbidden by Rome to publish his views on evolution, Teilhard's works did not appear to the public until after his death. Julian Huxley, grandson of Thomas Huxley ("Darwin's bulldog"), promoted Teilhard's books and wrote the foreword to the 1959 edition of *The Phenomenon of Man*.

Two more teeth were found in 1926, and on the basis of this flimsy evidence Davidson Black obtained a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation and commenced his own excavations in 1927. They were receiving \$20,000 a year for the dig, a massive amount of money at a time when one dollar would pay the daily wage for four workmen.

They found another tooth that fall, and in 1928 they found a lower jaw, more teeth, and some skull fragments. On the basis of this they were awarded an \$80,000 grant, which Black used to establish the Cenozoic Research Laboratory.

Between 1928 and 1937, many more bones were unearthed, including at least 14 partial skulls (Patrick O'Connell says 30), 11 lower jaws, and 147 teeth.

The *Sinanthropus* fossils vanished, and no one claims to know what happened to them. It is typically stated in evolutionary books that they disappeared in military action during World War II, but no evidence has been provided. O'Connell believed that the fossils disappeared to hide the fact that the models did not correspond to the originals, and he gave considerable evidence for this view. For example, in 1945 Weidenreich mentioned the skulls in a series of lectures that he gave at the University of California (subsequently published in the book *Apes, Giants and Men*). Weidenreich apparently believed the skulls were still preserved at the time when the Japanese surrendered. O'Connell concluded that the skulls were destroyed before the Chinese government returned to Peking and that this was done to remove the evidence of large-scale fraud. He says that Dr. Pei, who carried on the work after Weidenreich departed, "had very good reason to destroy the fossils, for the models supposed to have been made from them did not correspond with the description of the skulls published by three independent eye-witnesses: Dr. Marcellin Boule, Fr. Teilhard de Chardin and Abbe Breuil" (*Science of Today*, p. 111).

Evolutionists have argued that the loss of the fossils is not important since we have the casts that were made from the

bones, as well as descriptions, drawings, etc. The problem is that these were made by men whose honesty we have reason to suspect and who were *highly* biased and absolutely convinced that they were looking at a “missing link.” In the book *Fossil Men*, evolutionists Marcellin Boule and H.V. Vallois said, “Black, who had felt justified in forging the term *Sinanthropus* to designate *one* tooth, was naturally concerned to legitimize this creation when he had to describe a skull cap” (*Fossil Men*, 1957 translation of *Les Hommes Fossiles*, p. 141).

Dr. Duane Gish observes, “In other words, since Black had stuck his neck out on the basis of a single tooth and had erected the *Sinanthropus* category around that tooth, he felt compelled to model the facts to fit his scheme. We should, therefore, be very cautious in accepting the descriptions or models of *Sinanthropus* from the hand of Dr. Black” (*The Fossils Still Say No*, p. 290).

Further, there is clear evidence that the fossils and models and casts were doctored. Black’s representation of a *Sinanthropus* skull, which was produced in 1931, was not an actual cast but a model based on his own idea. It differed significantly from the description that had been given by Teilhard, Breuil, and Boule. Writing in a paper published in Belgium in July 1930, Teilhard said, “Viewed from the back ... the *Sinanthropus* skull has a roughly triangular shape like that of the simians rather than an ovoid one like that of present day men” (*Revue des questions scientifiques*, July 20, 1930, cited from Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 462). Black’s reconstruction even lacked the hole in the top that was found in *all* of the skulls.

Black’s desire was to locate *Sinanthropus* on the evolutionary scale between Java Man and Neanderthal, and he twisted the evidence to further this objective. “The model, then, was not a cast of the actual skull but an artificial representation of a creature of the imagination. ... Neither the model nor the description given by Dr. Black corresponds

with the description given by three independent eye-witnesses; the description does not even correspond with the artificial model described, and the actual skull and all the other skulls, which if they had remained, would be evidence of the fraud, have been destroyed" (O'Connell, *Science of Today and the Problems of Genesis*, pp. 121, 122).

Black also made a model of the jawbone of *Sinanthropus*, but this, too, was doctored. Black's successor, Weidenreich, who took over after the death of Black in 1934 at age 49, rejected Black's model. He pointed out that Black had created the jawbone by using two different fossils, one of an adult and one of a child, *in order to make it look more human*.

Weidenreich made his own deceptive cast or model, which differed from Black's. He claimed that it was a model of a *Sinanthropus* skull, but it was doubtless that of the largest of the human skulls that were discovered at the site. Though his model was based on the male skull, which was the only one with a brain capacity of 1200 cc, Weidenreich called it a female. Weidenreich claimed that the cast was one of three large *Sinanthropus* skulls discovered in 1936, but "the evidence points to the conclusion that the finding of the three skulls of large brain capacity in December 1936 is a pure invention" (O'Connell, p. 127).

This coincides, rather, with the discovery of the human skulls as reported by Teilhard in the French publication. O'Connell says, "There is no evidence that the original from which this new model is supposed to have been made ever existed. No photographs of the three skulls supposed to have been found in 1936 have been published, only photographs of the model, while actual photographs of the skulls of real men found in 1934 have been published and have been reproduced in the books by Weidenreich, Boule and Vallois, etc. This model, as far as one can judge from the photograph, resembles an ordinary dolichocephalic (longheaded) skull with prominent brow-ridges like the Australian aborigines. ... One thing is certain: the model produced by Dr Weidenreich

has no resemblance whatever to the skulls of *Sinanthropus* as described by Fr. T. de Chardin, Abbe Breuil and Boule” (p. 129).

The disappearance of the *Sinanthropus* skulls conveniently removed the hard evidence supporting both Black’s model and Weidenreich’s cast.

Dr. Gish asks, “How reliable are these models? Are they accurate casts of the originals, or do they reflect what Weidenreich thought they should look like? Why do his models differ so greatly from the earlier descriptions? These models of Weidenreich should be considered totally inadmissible as evidence related to the taxonomic affinities of *Sinanthropus*” (p. 292).

Not content to deal with the fossil evidence itself, Weidenreich followed in the footsteps of his evolutionary predecessors back to the time of Ernest Haeckel and commissioned a lady sculptor named Swan to produce a likeness of his mythical Mrs. *Sinanthropus*, which he dubbed *Nelly*. The sculpture “looks exactly like the usual caricature of the Neanderthal Man published in propagandist books” (O’Connell, p. 126).

Not to be outdone, the British Museum commissioned Maurice Wilson in 1950 to present Peking Man to the gullible public. There are two males and a female, all naked, in a cave setting. The female is building a fire, while one of the males is pounding one rock with another, perhaps fashioning a crude rock tool, while the other is dragging a deer to the fire. All of the individuals look human except for their dim-witted “caveman” faces. Ian Taylor observes, “Depicting early man quite naked is based entirely on the supposition that man evolved from the naked ape.”

A crucial part of the evidence, which was withheld from the public for many years and is still ignored or downplayed in evolutionary writings, was the discovery of several “modern humans” at the same site in 1933. Teilhard published this in an article the next year in a French

magazine, but the information did not appear in English at that time and, in fact, was not released officially by Pei and Weidenreich until six years after the discovery. In 1939, Weidenreich stated in an article in *Palaeontologia Sinica* that the skeletal remains of ten human beings (including the skulls of three adults) had been found (O'Connell, p. 112). He repeated this in his lectures at the University of California in 1945. These human fossils have been ignored and seriously downplayed ever since, yet they are essential for understanding the evidence at the Peking site. Ian Taylor observes:

“It took Weidenreich five years to finally break the news of the discovery of the true humans, and at that it was confined to the relative obscurity of the *Peking Natural History Bulletin*. Even so, the most popular books and most textbooks today never mention the appearance of true human beings at the site of Peking man” (*In the Minds of Men*, p. 236).

It has been claimed that the human fossils were found higher in the “strata,” implying that various levels of the site represented different time periods, but the evidence shows that the strata is all of one piece and that the humans and the “*Sinanthropus*” lived together. O'Connell observes, “There is no justification for representing these human fossils as belonging to a later date than the skulls of *Sinanthropus* for both were found buried under the same landslide that killed the human beings, and covered the ashes and debris in which the skulls of *Sinanthropus* (i.e., the skulls of baboons and macaques) were found” (*Science of Today*, p. 113). Pieces of “*Sinanthropus*” skulls were found on both levels (p. 123).

Also withheld and downplayed was the evidence that the “cave” is actually a collapsed large-scale quarry and lime-burning site. The quarrying of limestone was carried out at two levels, one above the other, on the face of the hill. The quarries were about 600 feet wide and extended into the hill to a depth of about 150 feet (O'Connell, p. 111). The hill

became unstable by this activity and a landslide buried both levels of the quarry.

The fossil-hunting excavation exposed both levels, and on the upper level was found an enormous heap of ash and debris 600 feet long, 90 feet wide, and 21 feet high. On the lower level was a heap of ash at least 36 feet high. At the bottom of both levels were thousands of quartz stones that had been brought there from somewhere else to construct the lime kilns. The stones had a layer of soot on one side. Tools for grading, scraping, cutting and beating were found at the site, “sometimes of fine workmanship.”

When you combine all of this with the fact that the bones of humans were found there and that the bones of 100 different animals were found intermingled with those of *Sinanthropus*, it adds up to the strongest scientific evidence that the animals, including some sort of apes, were the meals of the human workers, who were killed when the quarry collapsed.

All of the *Sinanthropus* skulls were bashed in so the brains could be extracted and eaten, whereas none of the human skulls found at the site were so abused. Evolutionists have theorized that perhaps *Sinanthropus* was a cannibal, but the more obvious conclusion is that the humans who maintained the quarry considered ape brains to be a delicacy. The fossils of baboons and macaque monkeys are found in great numbers in the vicinity of the dig (*Apes, Giants and Men*, p. 19).

Not every evolutionist bought into the Peking Man myth. In fact, Teilhard’s prominent scientist friends in France either questioned it or rejected it outright.

When Henri Breuil of the French Institute of Human Paleontology spent 19 days investigating Peking Man in 1931 at the invitation of Teilhard, who was a former student, he observed the evidence of a stone industry, including stones, tools, and “an ash heap seven meters deep that had evidently been kept going continuously for some time because the

minerals in the surrounding soil had fused together with the heat” (Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 234). Breuil said the skulls bore no resemblance to human skulls and questioned the idea that the animals represented by the skulls could have carried on such a large-scale industry. He concluded that the objections raised to the Peking Man “theory” were very strong, if not unanswerable (O’Connell, p. 119).

Marcellin Boule, another of Teilhard’s old professors in France, came to the same conclusion as Breuil when he examined the bones in the 1930s, and he stated his position even more unequivocally. Boule called the Peking ape-man “theory” a “fantastic hypothesis.” Boule “was angry at having traveled halfway around the world to see a battered monkey skull” (Taylor, p. 236). Boule wrote, “I take the liberty of preferring an opinion more in conformity with the conclusions from my studies, which is that the hunter (who battered the skulls) was a real man and that the cut stones, etc., were his handiwork. ... It seems to me rash to deem *Sinanthropus* the monarch of Choukoutien since he appears in the deposits in which he is found in the aspect of common game, like the animals associated with him” (*l’Anthropologie*, 1937, cited from O’Connell, p. 120).

Teilhard himself had said at first that “*Sinanthropus* manifestly resembles the great apes closely” (O’Connell, *Science of Today*, p. 118).

Evolutionary writings describe the 36-foot-deep ash heap as “traces of artificial fire,” because this better fits the “theory” that Peking Man was a rudimentary cave man who was learning how to use fire. This is how a painting in the British Museum depicts him.

While the term “traces of fire” was used by Teilhard in his description of the findings, what he actually said was “the traces of fire have accumulated to the depth of several meters” (*The Appearance of Man*, 1956 and 1965, p. 72, cited from Taylor, p. 236).

That is some cooking fire!

Sinanthropus pekinensis has been reclassified twice. It was renamed *Pithecanthropus pekinesis*, then reclassified as *Homo erectus pekinensis*. Thus, it is still considered a “missing link,” at least by American paleoanthropologists, when in fact Peking Man is a complete myth composed of both ape and human fossils.

In spite of the fact that Peking Man is shot through and through with duplicity and unanswered questions, for nearly a century it has been paraded to the world as evidence of the evolution of man from apes and as proof that the Bible is not true and that the gospel of Jesus Christ is, at best, an interesting religious myth. Only the Lord knows how many people, in every part of the world, have gone to their graves convinced that the Bible is not true based on evolutionary myths such as Peking Man, convinced especially by the mythical evolutionary artwork.

Gigantopithecus Blacki

In the 1930s, Ralph von Koenigswald, a German paleoanthropologist, named a new missing link *Gigantopithecus blacki*. *Gigantopithecus* means giant ape, and *blacki* refers to Davidson Black, a colleague and friend of Koenigswald. Black was also at the forefront of describing Peking Man as a missing link based on flimsy, contradictory, probably manipulated evidence.

Gigantopithecus was based on some teeth that Koenigswald found in a Chinese pharmacopoeia in Hong Kong in 1935. These fossils, called “dragon’s bones,” are ground up and used in Chinese folk medicine.

Franz Weidenreich, who took over Black’s place as head of the researchers studying Peking Man, considered the *Gigantopithecus blacki* teeth human-like and placed the creature in man’s family tree. He presented this view in his 1946 book *Apes, Giants, and Man*. Weidenreich theorized that man descended from giant apes.

This view was widely accepted at the time, but by the late 1950s, three jawbones and 1,300 teeth had been found, and after a re-examination of the fossils in the 1970s, it became evident that they did not have any human characteristics.

Today you will rarely find even a mention in evolutionary writings of the fact that the creature was once considered a missing link.

“*Gigantopithecus blacki* quietly faded from its place as an ape-to-man transition and became simply another extinct ape having played a small though significant part in the overall grand delusion” (Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 230).

Ramapithecus

For two decades *Ramapithecus* held sway in evolutionary writings as a missing link, until it was admitted that it was merely a relative of the orangutan.

In 1932, G. Edward Lewis, on a Yale University expedition to India, found a few teeth and a fragment of an upper jaw. Convinced that this meager set of fossils represented “the first branch from a line of apes that eventually evolved into humans,” he dubbed the creature *Ramapithecus*. This means “Rama’s ape,” so named after the mythical Hindu god. Lewis also found a part of a lower jaw that he dubbed *Bramapithecus*, after the Hindu god Brahma.

At first Lewis’ “theory” was rejected, but it began to be championed by Elwyn Simons when he arrived at Yale University’s Peabody Museum in 1960. Simons had two doctorates, one from Princeton and one from Oxford, but it turns out that he merely saw what he wanted to see. He was joined by David Pilbeam in 1963. Based on the flimsiest of evidence, they determined that the creature walked upright, used tools to prepare its food, hunted, and had a social life more complex than that of an ape (Lewis, *Bones of Contention*, p. 87). Though there were only two fragments of the upper jaw to work with and “no midline indicating the

center of the palate,” Simons reconstructed the jaw to look parabolic like a human’s rather than V-shaped like an ape’s. Again we see scientists engaged in myth-making.

In addition, another line of “evidence” was used to prove the creature’s status as a missing link. This was the thick cap of enamel on the molar teeth. Humans have this, whereas chimpanzees and gorillas have thin enamel. What was overlooked by the scientists was the fact that orangutans also have thick-enameled cheek teeth, and “thick enamel is in fact a common feature, a primitive, not specialized, condition” (Lewin, p. 96).

Of course, artists were assigned to depict the mythical creature. The *Ramapithecus* ape-man paintings and models were used widely in public school textbooks and museum displays. The Museum of Man at San Diego displayed an impressive flesh model of the ape-man to countless students, who assumed that it was irrefutable proof of evolution. As Dr. Gish says, “As eager-eyed students viewed this highly visible ‘proof’ of evolution, not one would have any idea it was based solely on a few teeth, a few fragments of a jaw, and a barrel full of evolutionary preconceived ideas” (*Evolution: The Fossils Still Say No*, p. 231).

In his influential book *Human Evolution*, J. B. Birdsell claimed that “there is general agreement that these finds represent a very early type of hominid,” but the “general agreement” was already falling apart.

Research by Robert Eckhard in 1972 told a different story. After measuring the teeth of fossilized and living apes and comparing these with *Ramapithecus*, he concluded that there is no compelling evidence for calling this creature “hominid.”

In 1973, Alan Walker and Peter Andrews concluded that the creature’s jaw “did not have the rounded dental arcade postulated in previous reconstructions” (*Nature*, Aug. 3, 1973).

In 1976, a nearly complete jaw of the creature was discovered during a Yale field expedition to Pakistan, and it was obvious that the jaw was V-shaped like an ape's and that Simons' original reconstruction had been made to look more human because of wishful thinking.

In 1982, Peter Andrews wrote, "*Ramapithecus* can no longer be considered as part of the human lineage" ("Hominoid Evolution," *Nature*, Vol. 295, 1982, p. 186).

David Pilbeam finally recanted his earlier views: "A group of creatures once thought to be our oldest ancestors may have been firmly bumped out of the human family tree. Many paleontologists have maintained that *Ramamorphs* are our oldest known ancestors [Pilbeam was one of the chiefest of these]. These conclusions were drawn from little more than a few jawbones and some teeth. Truthfully, it appears to be nothing more than an orangutan ancestor" (*Science*, April 6-7, 1982).

In a 1984 interview with Roger Lewin, Pilbeam admitted that he had doubts about the reconstruction from the beginning and that he merely saw what he wanted to see. "I 'knew' *Ramapithecus*, being a hominid, would have a short face and a rounded jaw--SO THAT'S WHAT I SAW" (Lewin, *Bones of Contention*, pp. 103, 123).

Pilbeam had not expressed those doubts in public; rather, he had been at the forefront of touting *Ramapithecus* as a missing link.

In 1978, Pilbeam had made the following enlightening admission: "I have come to believe that many statements we make about the hows and whys of human evolution say as much about us, the paleoanthropologists and the larger society in which we live, as about anything that 'really happened'" ("Rethinking Human Origins," *Discovery*, Vol. 13, 1978, p. 9).

Dr. Duane Gish says, "Today, in the light of additional material that has been discovered, most anthropologists have

discarded *Ramapithecus* as a hominid” (*Evolution: the Fossils Still Say No*, p. 228).

Roger Lewin, an evolutionist, says, “The dethroning of *Ramapithecus*--from putative first human in 1961 to extinct relative of the orangutan in 1982--is one of the most fascinating, and bitter, sagas in the search for human origins” (*Bones of Contention*, p. 86).

As it turned out, Rama’s ape was as mythical as the Hindu monkey god Hanuman. And what about *Bramapithecus*? It turned out to be the lower jaw of *Ramapithecus*!

Zinjanthropus (Nutcracker Man)

In 1959, Louis and Mary Leakey dubbed some fragments of teeth and skull *Zinjanthropus boisei* (“east Africa man”). It was nicknamed “Nutcracker Man” for its huge teeth. On the basis of some highly fragmented bone pieces (the skull consisted of 400 fragments) the September 1960 edition of *National Geographic* announced the find as “the world’s earliest known human.” It was said to be “obviously human.” Leakey even claimed that the creature “walked upright.”

Adding to the large collection of mythical ape-men reconstructions, *National Geographic* published a drawing of *Zinjanthropus*, depicting it as intelligent and humanlike, though with almost no forehead.

The story began to fall apart over the next few years. Evolutionary dating methods produced a wide range of results. At first it was said to be 600,000 years old. In 1961 it was dated at 1.75 million years by the University of California using the potassium-argon radiometric method. In 1968 it was dated at 10,000 years by the carbon 14 method! It should be obvious that the evolutionary dating methods are wildly unreliable.

A few years later Louis Leaky degraded *Zinjanthropus* to an ape and claimed that another fossil, dubbed *Homo habilis*, was the true missing link (*Newsweek*, April 13, 1964).

Zinjanthropus has since been renamed *Australopithecus boisei*, so “east Africa man” became “east Africa ape.”

To our knowledge, *National Geographic* did not publicly apologize for its role in promoting the myth of *Zinjanthropus* as an ape-man.

Homo Habilis (Handy Man)

In 1964, Louis Leakey discovered parts of a skeleton that he named *Homo habilis* (“handy man”). It was so named because of stone tools found in the same vicinity. Leakey announced that *Zinjanthropus* and *Australopithecines* were “offshoots” that eventually died out, while *Homo habilis* was the genuine missing link between apes and man (Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 242).

As with *Zinjanthropus*, *Homo Habilis* has since been downgraded to an *Australopithecine* by many evolutionary authorities.

“The case for *Homo habilis* was not strengthened by the facts that one of the hand bones was later found to be a vertebral fragment, two may have belonged to an arboreal monkey, and six came from some unspecified non-hominid (Reader, 1981, 189). Many authorities at the time believed that *Homo habilis* was an *Australopithecine*. Since Louis Leakey’s death in 1972, this has come to be the general, though not universal, opinion” (Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 242).

This shows how highly questionable the “science” is upon which the original decision was made, but museums still present *Homo habilis* as a legitimate “missing link.” The Museum of Man in San Diego puts *Homo habilis* just below *Homo ergaster*, which in turn is just below *Homo erectus*. The American Museum of Natural History in New York City also places *Homo habilis* below *Homo ergaster*, but on a sideline and not part of the lineage of *Homo erectus*.

Lothagam Man

In 1967, Bryan Patterson of Harvard University found one piece of lower jaw on Lothagam Hill in Kenya.

In the Time-Life publication *The Missing Link*, Maitland Edey confidently asserted, "Definitely hominid, it more closely resembles the human jaw ... than it does any ape jaw" (*The Missing Link*, 1972).

By 1977, though, *Current Anthropology* announced that new measurements showed the jaw could not have come from an early type of man after all (William Fix, *The Bone Peddlers*, p. 24).

Flipperpithecus

In 1983, *Science News* reported that a bone that had previously been reported as the clavical (shoulder bone) of a possible bipedal "hominoid" had turned out to be a dolphin's rib. Paleoanthropologist Tim White jested that the fossil should be dubbed *Flipperpithecus* (W. Herbert, *Science News*, 123:246, 1983, cited from Gish, *Evolution: the Fossils Still Say No*, p. 330).

In the same publication, Alan Walker warned that there is "a long tradition of misinterpreting various bones as hominoid shoulder bones" (Gish, p. 330). The leg bone of an alligator and the toe of a three-toed horse have also been identified as hominoid clavicals.

Donkey Man

Also in 1983, "experts" tentatively identified a skull fragment as the oldest human fossil ever found in Europe. The new hominid was dubbed "Orce Man" for the town located near the find. Spanish scientists announced a three-day symposium on the new find, but "when French experts revealed the fact that 'Orce Man' was most likely a skull fragment from a four-month-old donkey, embarrassed Spanish authorities sent out 500 letters canceling invitations to the symposium" (Gish, *The Fossils Still Say No*, p. 330).

Australopithecus Afarensis (Lucy)

The premier missing link between apes and men today is *Australopithecus afarensis*, a little creature that has been popularized by giving one set of fossils the endearing name of “Lucy.”

We have dealt with this under “Icons of Evolution.”

Ardipithecus Ramidus (Ardi)

This creature is one of the new kids on the ape-man block. Though it was named in September 1994 based on fossils found in Ethiopia by a research team headed by Tim White, who was also involved in the discovery of Lucy, it did not become a media sensation until 2009.

The first discovery of *Ardipithecus Ramidus* fossils in 1992-93 amounted to a few bone fragments. In 1994, a more extensive collection of bones was found, amounting to 45% of a skeleton. Originally labeled *Australopithecine*, the same family as Lucy, White later claimed that the bones represent a new genus, *Ardipithecus*.

Between 1997 and 2001, Yohannes Haile-Selassie, one of Tim White’s students, discovered some bone fragments that were named *Ardipithecus ramidus kadabba* in 2001 and renamed *Ardipithecus kadabba* in 2004. The pitifully small collection of bone fragments representing *Ardipithecus kadabba* took five years to collect, came from five different locations, and have been dated to different periods of time separated by hundreds of thousands of years (Brad Harrub, Ph.D., “*Ardipithecus ramidus kadabba* or What Bone Is the Toe Bone Connected To?” <http://www.apologeticspress.org/articles/2060>).

In July 23, 2001, *Time* magazine described *Ardipithecus ramidus kadabba* as a missing link in the supposed human evolutionary lineage, but the report grossly contradicts itself.

The magazine’s cover featured a painting of an ape-man walking upright and the feature article, entitled “How Apes Became Humans,” began with the unequivocal statement,

“Meet your newfound ancestor.” The article states, “... kadabba almost certainly walked upright much of the time.” On page 59 the photo of a fragment of a single toe bone is captioned, “This toe bone proves the creature walked on two legs.” Yet, for those who actually read the accompanying article, there is the following amazing statement:

“Beyond that, he’s dubious about categorizing the 5.2 million-year-old toe bone with the rest of the fossils: not only is it separated in time by several hundred thousand years, but it was also found some 10 miles away from the rest”!

Thus, there is no evidence that the toe bone, which is supposed to offer irrefutable evidence of *Ardipithecus ramidus*’ bipedality, actually belonged to the creature.

The article also states:

“Haile-Selassie and his colleagues haven’t collected enough bones yet to reconstruct with great precision what kadabba looked like. ... The size of kadabba’s brain and the relative proportions of its arms and legs were probably chimplike as well. ... Exactly how this hominid walked is still something of a mystery” (p. 57).

It is obvious that the painting that graced the cover of the magazine is another in a long line of mythical propaganda tools.

There is one thing in the article with which we strongly agree. On page 60, Meave Leakey, head of paleontology at the National Museum of Kenya and wife of Richard Leakey, is quoted as making the following statement in regard to the evolutionary theories of bipedalism:

“There are all sorts of hypotheses, and THEY ARE ALL FAIRY TALES really because you can’t prove anything.”

That is especially true when you try to prove that a certain creature walked upright by means of one toe bone that was found miles away from your other bone specimens and is

dated HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS of years younger than those other bones!!!!

In 2009, a partial skeleton of *Ardipithecus ramidus* was finally introduced to the public. It is dubbed *Ardi*, doubtless because White and company had observed how successful the name “Lucy” was in popularizing and humanizing ape bones in the imagination of people. The creature has an ape head, ape arms, ape hands, ape legs and feet, but it is treated as an ancestor of man because of the extreme evolutionary bias of its founders. There is no compelling reason to say it is anything other than an extinct ape, but evolutionists, having rejected the God of the Bible, have been searching for the missing link for 150 years, and they are not about to give up now. This is in spite of the fact that evolutionary ape-men have repeatedly turned out to be either hoaxes or cases of mistaken identity (e.g., Neanderthal man, Java Man, Piltdown Man, Peking Man, Nebraska Man).

Not surprisingly, *Ardi*’s introduction to the public was accompanied by a drawing of an upright creature that has an ape’s head and feet, but otherwise looks like a hairy woman. It is purely mythical.

Its founders claim that it walked upright, but, as with Lucy, this is disputed even by other evolutionists.

Ian Tattersall, curator of the American Museum of Natural History, admitted to National Public Radio that “some people are even suggesting there’s not much evidence of bipedality at all” (“Researchers Unearth A Hominid More Ancient Than Lucy,” NPR, *Science Friday*, Oct. 2, 2009).

Science magazine cited two paleoanthropologists who doubt that *Ardi* was bipedal:

“However, several researchers aren’t so sure about these inferences. Some are skeptical that the crushed pelvis really shows the anatomical details needed to demonstrate bipedality. The pelvis is ‘suggestive’ of bipedality but not conclusive, says paleoanthropologist Carol Ward of the University of Missouri, Columbia.

Also, *Ar. ramidus* ‘does not appear to have had its knee placed over the ankle, which means that when walking bipedally, it would have had to shift its weight to the side,’ she says. Paleoanthropologist William Jungers of Stony Brook University in New York state is also not sure that the skeleton was bipedal” (Ann Gibbons, “A New Kind of Ancestor: Ardipithecus Unveiled,” *Science*, October 2, 2009).

Even in the midst of the media frenzy, *Time* magazine admitted that “looking at the evidence, different paleoanthropologists may have different interpretations of how Ardi moved or what she reveals about the last common ancestor of humans and chimps” (Michael Lemonick and Andrea Dorfman, “Excavating Ardi: A New Piece for the Puzzle of Human Evolution,” *Time*, Oct. 1, 2009).

I have observed rhesus macaque monkeys in Kathmandu, Nepal, walking upright for considerable distances, but they are neither “bipedal” nor “missing links.” The pygmy chimpanzee of Zaire walks upright so often that it has been dubbed “a living link” (James Perloff, *Tornado in a Junkyard*, p. 101).

By May 2010, the hype over Ardi had faded and *Time* magazine published a report entitled “Ardi: The Human Ancestor Who Wasn’t?” It noted, “Two new articles being published by *Science* question some of the major conclusions of Ardi’s researchers, including whether this small, strange-looking creature is even a human ancestor at all.” Esteban Sarmiento, a primatologist at the Human Evolution Foundation, stated that White “showed no evidence that Ardi is on the human lineage.”

It is important to understand that the pelvis of Ardi was “found crushed nearly to smithereens and needed extensive digital reconstruction” (*Time*, Oct. 1, 2009). I, for one, do not trust dyed-in-the-wool evolutionists to reconstruct anything. We are reminded of the daring reconstruction of Lucy’s pelvis by one of its promoters in such a fashion that it wondrously

fits their “theory” that it was bipedal. We are reminded, in fact, of 150 years of mythical ape-men reconstructions.

Homo Erectus

Homo erectus is an alleged “missing link” that was supposed to have existed in the evolutionary scale between *Homo habilis* and Neanderthal, between 50,000 to 2 million years ago (Lockwood, *The Human Story*, p. 69).

Homo erectus is supposed to be the first “hominid” to use hand axes, control fire, and cook food.

In 1950, Java Man was renamed *Homo erectus*.

The evolutionist’s own dating of *Homo erectus* causes at least three great problems.

First, *Homo erectus* lived during the same time as *Homo habilis*, the creature that was supposed to have preceded it in the evolutionary process. “Thus the almost universally accepted view that some form of *Homo habilis* evolved into *Homo erectus* (or *Homo ergaster*) becomes impossible” (Lubenow, p. 119).

Second, *Homo erectus* lived contemporaneously with “modern humans” (“Latest *Homo erectus* of Java: Potential Contemporaneity with *Homo sapiens* in South Asia,” *Science*, Dec. 13, 1996). There are at least 78 *Homo erectus* fossil individuals dated more recently than 30,000 years, the youngest being 6,000 years old (Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, p. 119).

Lubenow observes, “*Homo habilis* and *Homo erectus* existed side by side as contemporaries for half a million years [by evolutionary dating methods]. The fossil record also shows that *Homo erectus* lived alongside the early *Homo sapiens* and the Neanderthals for the entire 700,000 years of early *Homo sapiens* history and the 800,000 years of Neanderthal history, and that *Homo erectus* lived alongside modern *Homo sapiens* for two million years. This does not constitute an evolutionary sequence (*Bones of Contention*, p. 120).

Third, *Homo erectus* lived (supposedly) for nearly 2 million years basically UNCHANGED! That is *not* evolution.

Another problem with *Homo erectus* is the fact that *he looks like modern man!* Though evolutionary art typically depicts him as subhuman and part ape, the fossils don't support that view. As with Neanderthal, all of the characteristics that are supposedly unique to *Homo erectus* can be found among modern men.

Some evolutionists admit this.

Gabriel Lasker of Wayne State University says, "Even if one ignores transitional or otherwise hard to classify specimens and limits consideration to the Java and Peking populations, the range of variation of many features of *Homo erectus* falls within that of modern man" (*Physical Anthropology*, 1973, p. 284).

Milford Wolpoff of America, Wu Xin Zhi of China, and Alan Thorne of Australia agree. "In our view, there are two alternatives. We should either admit that the *Homo erectus*/*Homo sapiens* boundary is arbitrary and use nonmorphological criteria [criteria other than form and appearance] for determining it, or *Homo erectus* should be sunk [into *Homo sapiens*]" (*The Origins of Modern Humans*, 1984, pp. 465-466).

Yet another problem for *Homo erectus* is that he *acts* like modern man. Again, he was not the half-ape brute that is depicted in evolutionary art. Not only did he control fire and use a wide range of tools, including the hand axe, but he also has been found in association with accurate throwing weapons, painted carved figurines, and even watercraft (Lubenow, pp. 130-134).

Dr. Alan Thorne, paleoanthropologist at the Australian National University, said, "They're not *Homo erectus*; they're people" (*The Australian*, Aug. 19, 1993).

The evolutionist cannot prove from the fossils that *Homo erectus* is not the same as modern man. He has to find refuge in his mythical dating system and evolutionary assumptions.

Darwinius Masillae (Ida)

In May 2009 the evolutionary press loudly announced the discovery of an alleged missing link named *Darwinius masillae* (in honor of Charles Darwin). It is supposed to be 47 million years old. Having learned their lesson from Lucy, the creature was dubbed *Ida* to create human interest and sympathy (*Ida* is the owner's daughter's name).

The fossil was discovered in 1983 in a quarry in Germany. It was a small, long-tailed creature about the size of a cat. It is amazingly well preserved (90 percent complete) and even includes fur and soft tissue, including the remnants of its last meal of fruit and leaves, all of which point to a date much younger than the one assigned by evolutionists.

In 2007 the fossil was purchased by Norwegian paleontologist Jørn Hurum acting for various museums for the vast sum of three-quarter million dollars. Hurum is a vertebrate paleontologist at the geological museum of the University of Oslo. An enthusiastic promoter and popularizer of evolution, he has written a book *Menneskets utvikling (The Evolution of Man)* and hosts science programs on television and radio.

The public unveiling of the fossil was a wild-eyed media frenzy. A&E's History Channel purchased the rights to make a documentary titled *The Link*. They reportedly paid more for this than for any other documentary they have produced (Elizabeth Cline, "Ida-lized: The Branding of a Fossil," *Seed* magazine, May 22, 2009). ABC News signed a deal for an exclusive interview on *Good Morning America*, *Nightline*, and *World News with Diane Sawyer*. Little Brown & Co. bought publishing rights to a book about the fossil titled, like the documentary, *The Link*. A ceremony was held at the American Museum of Natural History attended by the mayor of New York and sponsored by the History Channel. The documentary also aired on BBC One in the UK. Filmmaker Atlantic Productions launched a website to promote the fossil.

Ida was presented as the link between prosimian and simian, or between apes and non-apes. It was called “a revolutionary scientific find that will change everything.” It was called the eighth wonder of the world, “our Mona Lisa,” and an evolutionary “Rosetta Stone.” It was likened to “finding the Lost Ark, the scientific equivalent of the Holy Grail.”

Hurum claimed that “the fossil will probably be pictured in all the textbooks for the next 100 years,” and he is probably right. It has all of the makings of an evolutionary icon myth in the same league as Haeckel’s embryo chart, the horse chart, the peppered moth, and the Miller experiment.

British naturalist David Attenborough boasted, “Now people can say, ‘Okay, you say we’re primates ... show us the link.’ The link, they would have said until now, is missing. Well, it is no longer missing.”

Evolutionists believe that 50 million years ago two groups of animals existed that eventually gave rise to apes and then humans. One is the tarsidae, the supposed precursor of the tarsier. The other is the adapidae, which supposedly gave rise to the lemur (a small tree-climbing primate). Evolutionists disagree on whether the apes came from the tarsidae or the adapidae. Ida is supposed to be evidence of the latter.

What do we say about Ida as a “missing evolutionary link”?

First, the evolutionists themselves do not agree about Ida.

When other scientists finally had the opportunity to examine the description of the fossil, the original claims were widely disputed.

Erik Seiffert of New York’s Stony Brook University said he had discovered a fossil in Egypt (which he named *Afradapis*) remarkably similar to Ida that shows that it is more akin to lemurs than to monkeys or man. He said, “Our analysis and results have convinced us that Ida was not an ancestor of monkeys, apes or humans” (“Eighth wonder’ Ida is not

related to humans, claim scientists,” *The Guardian*, Oct. 22, 2009).

The research of Seiffert and his team was published in the October 2009 issue of *Nature* magazine.

The claim that *Ida* is a missing link in human ancestry is also disputed in a study by Blythe Williams, professor of paleontology at Duke University, joined by Christ Kirk, professor of anthropology at the University of Texas, and others. They published a point-by-point rebuttal to Hurum’s findings. Kirk says, “Many lines of evidence indicate that *Darwinius* has nothing at all to do with human evolution” (“Ancient Primate Fossil Roils scientific Community,” *AOL News*, March 6, 2010).

Dr. Chris Beard, curator of the Carnegie Museum of Natural History said he “would be absolutely dumbfounded if it turns out to be a potential ancestor to humans” (Christine McGourty, “Scientists Hail Stunning Fossil,” *BBC News*, May 19, 2009).

Peter Brown of the University of New England said the paper on *Ida* “had insufficient evidence that *Darwinius* was ancestral to the simians” (Leigh Dayton, “Scientists divided on *Ida*,” *The Australian*, May 21, 2009).

In March 2010, the *Journal of Human Evolution* published a paper by scientists at the University of Texas at Austin, Duke University, and the University of Chicago. Chris Kirk, associate professor of anthropology at the University of Texas, said, “Many lines of evidence indicate that *Darwinius* has nothing at all to do with human evolution” (“Recently Analyzed Fossil Was Not Human Ancestor,” The University of Texas at Austin, *News*, March 2, 2010). Joining Kirk in writing the paper were Blythe Williams, Richard Kay, and Callum Ross.

Second, if you take away the evolutionary assumptions, there is zero evidence that the fossil is anything other than a (possibly) extinct lemur-like creature.

The major evidences proposed for Ida's link to man are as follows: (1) It had an opposable thumb, but lemurs and all primates have opposable thumbs. (2) The talus bone is said to be the same shape as in humans, but that means nothing. It is clear that Ida had a long tail and man has no tail! (3) Ida lacks the grooming claw and a toothcomb (a fused row of teeth) of the lemur, but monkeys also lack these today and they aren't humans! As Answers in Genesis says, "These are minor differences easily explained by variation within a kind" ("Ida: The Missing Link at Last?" May 19, 2009).

Answers in Genesis further observes, "A fossil can never show evolution. Fossils are unchanging records of dead organisms. Evolution is an alleged process of change in live organisms. Fossils show 'evolution' only if one presupposes evolution, then uses that presupposed belief to *interpret* the fossil."

Third, the fossilization disproves evolution.

We are told, "The scientists speculate she was overcome by carbon dioxide fumes while drinking from the Messel lake. Hampered by her broken wrist, she slipped into unconsciousness, was washed into the lake and sank to the bottom, where unique fossilisation conditions preserved her for 47 million years."

This is scientific nonsense. Nothing like that happens today. When an animal dies it is quickly devoured by other animals, worms, and bacteria. Such amazing preservation is more consistent with a rapid burial and fossilization such as that caused by a catastrophic global flood. Ida was found with "hundreds of well-preserved specimens."

Fourth, Jørn Hurum and his associates have too much at stake personally to be trusted in this matter.

Hurum was convinced almost from the first time he was shown color photos of the fossil that “the specimen he was looking at could be one of the holy grails of science--the ‘missing link’ from the crucial time period” (James Randerson, “Fossil Ida: A profile of palaeontologist Jørn Hurum,” *The Guardian*, May 19, 2009). He admitted to the press that finding Ida was “a dream come true.” Like Charles Darwin, Thomas Huxley, Ernst Haeckel, and Percival Lowell, Hurum sees what he wants to see. Though he and his team studied the fossil in secret for two years, between 2007 and 2009, it is obvious that their minds were made up quickly, because during that time they were already negotiating with the aforementioned organizations for hefty publishing rights. The deal with the History Channel was completed the summer of 2008, only months after the fossil was obtained. Hurum has as much as admitted that the fossil is about money. He said, “You need an icon or two in a museum to drag people in, this is our Mona Lisa and it will be our Mona Lisa for the next 100 years” (“Fossil Ida,” *The Guardian*, May 19, 2009).

Fifth, similarities and homology can never prove evolution.

“If two organisms have similar structures, the only thing it *proves* is that the two have similar structures. One must presuppose evolution to say that the similarities are due to evolution rather than design. Furthermore, when it comes to ‘transitional forms,’ the slightest similarities often receive great attention while major differences are ignored” (“Ida: The Missing Link at Last?” May 19, 2009, Answers in Genesis).

Sixth, if evolution were true, there would be *real* transitional forms.

“Instead, the best ‘missing links’ evolutionists can come up with are strikingly similar to organisms we see today, usually with the exception of minor, controversial, and inferred anatomical differences” (“Ida: The Missing Link at Last?” May 19, 2009).

When it comes to the “missing links” between apes and man, there is no science, only presumption and wild-eyed stories. There is zero scientific evidence that any of these creatures “descended” from any other or that any of them have an evolutionary association with man. This is not science; it is myth-making.

African Eve: The “out Of Africa” Hypothesis

The Out of Africa Model of human evolution was developed largely in an attempt to avoid the intrinsic and historic racism of Darwinian evolution. Melvin Lubenow says, “There is no question that the Out of Africa Model with its African Eve, arose more out of political correctness than out of scientific data” (*Bones of Contention*, p. 156).

After the Nazi Holocaust of World War II, Hitler’s terrible experiment in treating some groups of people such as Jews and Slavs as inferior and of pushing evolutionary survival of the fittest to the ultimate limit, evolutionists desired earnestly to distance themselves from the racism of their doctrine. They needed to show that all living men evolved in a short period of time from the same stock, as opposed to the previous idea that some types of men were still lower on the evolutionary scale.

This was a big task, because for more than a century evolutionary art had typically depicted pre-*Homo sapiens* as looking for all the world like some African natives and Australian aborigines.

Even as late as the 1960s, evolutionist Carleton Coon was dividing mankind into five races that supposedly evolved

from *Homo erectus*: Caucasoids (whites), Mongoloids (Asians), Australoids (natives of Australia, New Guinea and Melanesia), Capoids (African bushmen), and Congoids (African pygmies and Negroes). Coon believed that Caucasoids evolved about 500,000 years ago, whereas Congoids evolved about 40,000 years ago. That is a typical evolutionary teaching, but it is obvious that if “Caucasoids” have been evolving for 500,000 years they are much advanced over “Congoids.” The racial superiority is unavoidable, being inherent in the doctrine.

The Out of Africa Model, which was invented in the late 1980s, is an attempt to change the picture. It is also called *African Eve* or *Mitochondrial Eve*. This doesn’t mean that evolutionists believe that modern man came from one mother; it refers, rather, to one original population. The following are the principles of this hypothesis.

1. *Homo erectus* evolved out of *Homo habilis* or australopithecine stock in Africa about 2 million years ago, learning to walk upright, make tools, and use fire. Some of the *Homo erectus* migrated into Europe and became Neanderthals.

2. Out of the *Homo erectus* population in Africa, one small group evolved modern human bodies (though still acting like stone age cavemen). This population represents the “African Eve.” They migrated out of Africa 100,000-150,000 years ago, developed a more modern culture, eliminated the Neanderthals, and replaced all other groups of *Homo erectus* that did not make the evolutionary cut.

3. Africa therefore is the birthplace of all modern humans, and all humans living today are from the same stock and are too similar to bear significant racial inferiorities.

The African Eve hypothesis, allegedly based on genetics, is typically presented as fact by the popular media and even by many within the scientific community. Yet Melvin Lubenow and others have proven that the evidence is inconclusive, contradictory, and dependent upon unproven evolutionary

assumptions (e.g., *Bones of Contention*, “African Eve,” chapter 17, and “mtDNA Neandertal Park--A Catch-22,” chapter 23).

African Eve was invented in 1987 by three biochemists at the University of California at Berkeley. They used mitochondria DNA, which is alleged to pass directly from mother to child, to trace human origins.

This is shaky science at best. Using the evolutionist’s own publications, it is possible to gather statements both strongly in favor of and strongly opposed to Mitochondrial Eve. Jonathan Marks of Yale University observes, “And with each new genetic study that claims to validate ‘Eve’ conclusively, there comes an equal and opposite reaction, showing the study’s weakness” (“Race and Evolution,” *Journal of Human Evolution*, October 1997).

Further, paleoanthropologists are often at war with biologists on this issue, because the fossil evidence is largely contrary to African Eve. For example, according to Out of Africa, all *Homo erectus*-like people were replaced by the African Eve people long ago, but Melvin Lubenow points out: “The Asian fossils do not show replacement or discontinuity. In fact, there is an amazing continuity of *Homo erectus*-like fossils in Asia beginning at 2 million years ago all the way to 6,000 year ago and possibly to just a few hundred years ago (the Cossack skull)” (*Bones of Contention*, p. 177). There is also evidence of Neanderthals living only 17,000 years ago (by the evolutionary dating method).

The biologists say that the paleoanthropologists are wrong, because the fossils cannot be interpreted objectively, while the paleoanthropologists argue that geneticists are wrong, because molecular genetics is both subjective and preliminary.

We agree on both counts, and we appreciate this assistance in debunking evolution!

As for the statement by Out of Africa proponents that “we are all Africans,” Melvin Lubenow observes:

“One senses a large dose of political correctness in that statement. When the first Neanderthal fossils were found, they were thought by many to represent our oldest direct ancestor. Yet no one said, ‘In this sense, we are all German.’ When Java Man was discovered, he was thought to be our oldest direct ancestor. Yet no one said, ‘In this sense, we are all Javanese.’ Later, the Peking Man fossils were discovered. They were thought by many to also represent our oldest direct ancestors. Yet no one said, ‘In this sense, we are all Chinese’” (*Bones of Contention*, p. 195).

Though Out of Africa is a clever attempt to dodge the racist implication of evolution, it still makes a mockery of human morality and leaves no basis for treating one’s fellow man with compassion. According to this hypothesis, a small group of *Homo erectus* evolved to modern human status through mutations and natural selection and then replaced (partly through “elimination”) all of the other lesser developed “people” who represented mankind at that time. In light of this, why would it be wrong today for some groups of modern man to eliminate other groups after the fashion of the British slaughter of the Tasmanians or Hitler’s holocaust against the Jews? Why would it be wrong for an individual modern man to kill another man? I have never heard an evolutionist even hint that it was wrong for the children of African Eve to kill *Homo erectus* and Neanderthal individuals. Why, then, is it wrong for us to do something like that today? When and why did man become subject to such morality, and why should it be absolute?

Russia’s Ape-Men Experiments

In the 1920s, Ilya Ivanov (1870-1932), Russia’s top animal-breeding scientist, with the backing of the atheistic state, attempted to breed ape-men. Ivanov, an internationally acclaimed scientist, had perfected artificial insemination and was the first to use it in horse breeding. He had successfully created a zeedonk (zebra-donkey) and other things. Of

course, these are simply the product of interbreeding within the bounds of biblical “kinds.”

Ivanov worked at the same Institute of Experimental Medicine in St. Petersburg as the famous Ivan Pavlov, who won the Nobel Prize.

Based on his evolutionary dogma, Ivanov assumed that he could do the same thing with men and apes, not believing that God created the barriers between kinds. Of course, if evolution is true and man descended from apes, Ivanov’s experiment would make perfect sense. If man is simply an animal, a creature that evolved blindly out of the animal kingdom, there would be nothing wrong with such an experiment.

In 1910, Ivanov presented his objective before the World Congress of Zoologists in Austria. In 1924, he applied to the Stalinist government for approval of his plan. He emphasized the potential for “anti-religious propaganda” if his experiment were to succeed. He wanted to fertilize apes and “bring back the mothers with their little human apes to gladden the hearts of the Anti-God Society in Soviet Russia and prove that ‘There is no God’” (R.O.G. Urch, *The Rabbit King of Russia*, London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1939, p. 83). The objective was to “prove that men and animals are one, that religion is wrong, that there is no God” (Ibid., p. 82). (Urch was correspondent for *The Times* of London for Russia and the Baltic states in the 1920s and 1930s.)

In 1925, Ivanov was given official permission by the communists. The papers were signed by Anatolii Lunacharsky, the Commissar of the Enlightenment, and Lev Kamenev, a member of the Soviet Politburo. The Soviet Academy of Sciences granted Ivanov \$10,000, the modern equivalent of a million dollars or more, to pursue experiments in Africa, and the Soviet government’s funding was to increase to \$100,000. Thus, the project was approved at the highest levels of the communist Russian government.

This would have been impossible without Stalin's own imprimatur.

The project was discussed in the world press. *The New York Times* announced it under the heading "Soviet Backs Plan to Test Evolution" (June 17, 1926). *Time* magazine ran two articles, "Men and Apes" (June 28, 1926) and "Ape-child?" (Aug. 16, 1926).

Ivanov received support from the elite Pasteur Institute, both from its headquarters in Paris and its facilities in West Africa.

The American Association for the Advancement of Atheism got behind the project. Its head, a lawyer named Howell England, met with Ivanov and promised financial support. England was excited about the potential to disprove the Creator God of the Bible. He encouraged Ivanov to use four types of apes: orangutans, chimpanzees, gorillas, and gibbons, because he was convinced that different types of humans arose from different types of apes. He wanted Ivanov to pair the orangutan with Asians, gorillas with blacks, chimpanzees with whites, and gibbons with Jews.

Working in French Guinea, Ivanov inseminated female apes with human sperm. (He also wanted to inseminate human women with ape sperm, and his first choice was black African woman because of his view that they were lower on the evolutionary scale and therefore closer to apes biologically; but the French government refused to allow him to conduct these experiments. We don't know the exact result of his insemination of apes, though we do know that a "steamer bearing Ivanoff's 'interesting female apes' was lost with all hands in the Black Sea" (*The Rabbit King*, p. 83, footnote).

Upon Ivanov's return to Russia in 1927, the Stalinist government provided him with Soviet women as guinea pigs. The experiments were conducted at the Primatological Nursery* on the Black Sea which Ivanov set up under the auspices of the communist government. Ivanov also

transplanted a woman's ovary into a female chimp. At least five of the women died in the Frankenstein experiments. (* The Primatological Nursery provided apes to fly in Soviet rocket capsules during the Sputniks program in the 1960s.)

There is also the possibility that Stalin hoped to breed an army of super ape-men. This is described in the article "Stalin's half-man, half-ape super warriors" by C. Stephen and A. Hall, *The Scotsman*, Aug. 2, 2006, and in "The Forgotten Scandal of the Soviet Ape-man" by Stephanie Pain, *NewScientist.com*, Aug. 20, 2008. For more about Ivanov's experiment see Alexander Etkind, "Beyond Eugenics: The forgotten scandal of hybridizing humans and apes," *Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences*, June 2008.

Keys To Analyzing The Evolutionary Ape-Man Data

Following are some keys to keep in mind when evaluating evolutionary ape-man "evidence":

First, it is impossible to prove evolutionary lineage from fossils. How could you possibly prove such a thing? Some evolutionists have admitted this. Colin Patterson of the British Natural History Museum said: "... statements about ancestry and descent are not applicable in the fossil record. ... 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" (letter to Luther Sunderland, April 10, 1979, cited from Sunderland's *Darwin's Enigma*, pp. 101, 102). Henry Gee, chief science writer for *Nature* magazine, said: "No fossil is buried with its birth certificate. ... [Each fossil] is an isolated point, with no knowable connection to any other given fossil, and all float around in an overwhelming sea of gaps. ... To take a line of fossils and claim that they represent a lineage is not a scientific hypothesis that can be tested, but an assertion that carries the same authority as a bedtime story--amusing,

perhaps even instructive, but not scientific” (*In Search of Deep Time*).

Second, it must be understood that the research is biased in the extreme. Evolutionary anthropologists are searching for evidence to prove their theories. They see what they assume to be true, and their statements must be studied within this context. Thus, creationists examining the “evidence” for ape-men must make a distinct and careful difference between the actual facts and their interpretation. As Terry Mortensen (Ph.D. in the History of Geology from Coventry University) of the Creation Museum told me in July 2009:

“I have studied a lot of arguments from evolutionists; I have had seven formal debates with evolutionary professors at universities, and I have never read or heard any scientific fact that contradicts what the Bible says. There are evolutionist’s interpretations of the facts, but the facts themselves are not contrary to Scripture.”

Third, evolutionary anthropologists jump to quick conclusions which they publish loudly, and which are promoted by the mainstream media, and it often takes decades for the truth to be told. Furthermore, the truth is never broadcast as loudly as the original myth. For example, Java Man was announced to be a “missing link” based on exceedingly dubious evidence (a partial skull, a leg bone found 50 feet away but assumed to belong to the same individual, and three teeth). The print media published the news, complete with reconstructions of the supposed ape-man. Decades later Java Man largely disappeared from museums and textbooks. This has happened repeatedly. Dr. Gish observes: “Suggested intermediates for the origin of man all seem to eventually experience a similar fate. Immediately following the announcement of the discovery comes sharp disagreement among the experts, this is followed by gradual acceptance by the majority; then skeptical voices begin to be heard in increasing volume;

finally, the creature is cast out of the family tree. This process required about fifty years for *Ramapithecus* and for Piltdown Man, and about 100 years to dethrone Neanderthal Man” (p. 279).

Fourth, the field is rife with contradictory viewpoints and changing opinions, the evolutionists themselves often being hopelessly divided. This is why two different books on human evolution have been titled “Bones of Contention.” As Dr. Gish observes in reference to the Lucy fossils: “... we have discovered that ‘there is a jungle out there.’ First, almost all investigators have changed their minds at one time or another, and yet no consensus is in sight. Richard Leakey has been most candid in this respect. In an article published in March of 1982 in *New Scientist*, he is reported to have said, ‘I am staggered to believe that as little as a year ago I made the statements that I made.’ Although there is little doubt that Leakey believes that the australopithecines walked erect, he is quoted in this same article as saying that paleontologists do not know whether *Australopithecus* walked upright. ... [But in 1981] Leakey had stated that ‘we can now say that the australopithecines definitely walked upright’” (*The Fossils Still Say No*, pp. 249, 250).

Fifth, often the evidence is flimsy. Peking Man and Nebraska Man and *Gigantopithecus* were constructed on the basis of one or two teeth. Java Man consisted of only a skullcap and a thighbone. Louis Leakey named *Zinjanthropus* a missing link on the basis of a skull consisting of 400 fragments. The *Ramapithecus* jaw was reconstructed to look parabolic like a human’s even though there were only two fragments of the upper jaw to work with and “no midline indicating the center of the palate.”

Sixth, evolutionists do not properly take into account the great variability among the same types of creatures. Dr. Gish observes: “[The] failure to take into account the considerable variability among primates has led some anthropologists to attribute great evolutionary significance to

differences between fossil specimens that lie well within the range of variability of a single species” (*Evolution: The Fossils Still Say No*, p. 276).

Seventh, evolutionists often make too much of the similarity between species. Humans share many similarities with various animals, but that is not because they are related but because they were made by the same Creator to live in the same environment. “Creation scientists maintain that similarity does not necessarily establish a genetic relationship” (Gish, p. 221). The fact that modern man might share some characteristic with some extinct ape does not make the ape a “missing link.”

Eighth, dating of fossils is based on subjective criteria and unproven assumptions. This becomes evident when evolutionists themselves change their dates by wild degrees. Richard Leakey, for example, changed the date of the fossil KNM-ER 1510 by 1.8 million years! Further, hard evidence, such as lack of fossilization for alleged multi-million-year old bones and the existence of younger aged fauna in the same strata, is often ignored. For example, the fossils of *Sinanthropus* found near Peking are dated between one and 2 million years old. But in the same dig and in the same strata of the dig sophisticated tools were found that are ordinarily dated by evolutionists to about 35,000 years old (Gish, p. 295). How can the tools be a couple of million years younger than the bones found next to them? Evolutionary dating of fossils must be taken with a grain of salt.

Predictions

Making educated predictions and testing them is part of the scientific method. Carl Werner, M.D., says:

“Using the scientific method, a scientist will start with an idea (theory or hypothesis) and then test the validity of his idea by vigorously trying to disprove it. If he or she can’t falsify it, then the original theory remains tentatively true” (*Evolution: The Grand Experiment*, Vol. 2, p. 9).

Predictions Of Evolution

Science journalist Richard Milton refers to the “infinite elasticity of Darwinian Theory” because of “its ability to interpret the data in any one of a number of completely different ways--even with diametrically opposed conclusions--as long as those ways are consistent with the central belief in Darwinian evolution itself” (*Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, p. 113).

“As a theory, natural selection makes no unique predictions but instead is used retrospectively to explain every outcome: and a theory that explains everything in this way, explains nothing. Natural selection is not a mechanism: it is a rationalization after the fact” (Milton, p. 130).

This is true, but we will mention one prediction that Darwinian evolution should require with ease.

Billions of transitional creatures and organs

Darwin admitted that his doctrine required that “the number of intermediate and transitional links, between all living and extinct species, must have been inconceivably great” (*On the Origin of Species*). In fact, “Darwin’s theory predicted not merely that fossil transitions would be found; it implied that a truly complete fossil record would be *mostly* transitionals” (Phillip Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, p. 48).

“... if life has evolved in the way that Darwin proposed, there should be many millions of transitional species--invertebrates with rudimentary backbones; fish with incipient legs; reptiles with half-formed wings, and so on. Indeed, given a theory that postulates continuous random genetic mutation, and hence a continuous spectrum of life forms, constantly evolving to become better and better adapted, such specimens should be the rule rather than the exception. Life itself should be boldly innovative, rather than cautiously conservative” (Milton, *Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, p. 254).

When contemplating the absence of proof for his doctrine in the fossil record Darwin asked, “... why, if species have descended from other species by insensibly fine gradations, do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms? Why is not all nature in confusion instead of the species being, as we see them, well defined?”

He even considered the incredible possibility that “nature” had somehow hidden the evidence for his doctrine. “Nature may almost be said to have guarded against the frequent discovery of her transitional or linking forms” (*On the Origin of Species*).

“The absence of transitional intermediates was troubling even to Darwin’s loyal supporter T.H. Huxley, who warned Darwin repeatedly in private that a theory consistent with the evidence would have to allow for some big jumps” (Phillip Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, p. 46).

“The case for Darwinism would be made convincingly if someone were to produce a sequence of fossils from a sequence of adjacent strata (such as ammonite species or sea urchins) showing indisputable signs of gradual progressive change on the same basic stock, but above the species level (as opposed to subspecific variation) ... But this simple relationship is not what is shown in the sequence of the rocks. Nowhere in the world has anyone met this simple evidential criterion with a straightforward fossil sequence from successive strata. Yet there are so

many billions of fossils available from so many thousands of strata that the failure to meet this modest demand is inexplicable if evolution has taken place in the way Darwin and his followers have envisaged. ... Schoolchildren should be able to do this on an afternoon's nature study trip to the local quarry, but even the world's foremost paleontologists have failed to do so with the whole Earth to choose from and the resources of the world's greatest universities at their disposal" (Richard Milton, *Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, p. 110).

In the study on the fossil record in the chapter "Icons of Evolution" we have documented the gross lack of evidence for Darwinian evolution. Instead of gradualism, we see the sudden appearance of fully-formed creatures with no evolutionary history.

Predictions Of Biblical Creationism

Biblical creationism makes many clear predictions. As Jason Lisle, Ph.D. in astronomy, says:

"Christians need to understand that their worldview is not merely hypothetical. The real universe is the biblical universe. Since the Bible is true, it can be used to explain and make successful predictions about what we find in the physical universe. Genetics, geology, astronomy, paleontology, archaeology, and many other sciences all show facts that are what we would expect, given the truth of the Bible" (Jason Lisle, *The Ultimate Proof of Creation*, p. 98).

Consider some of these predictions:

The universe will behave according to established laws.

If God created the universe as described in the Bible, we can predict that it will behave according to established laws, and this is exactly what we find. This is so evident and so amazing that many non-Christian scientists have become convinced that it points to "intelligent design."

Paul Davies, for example, in the *Goldilocks Enigma* describes the orderly, law-abiding nature of the universe as evidence for intelligence of some sort. Just as Goldilocks found the porridge not too hot or too cold, but “just right,” so the universe is “just right” for human life on earth.

“Instead of finding that space is filled with a dog’s breakfast of unrelated bric-a-brac, astronomers see an orchestrated and coherent unity. On the largest scale of size there is order and uniformity” (*The Goldilocks Enigma*, p. 20).

The universe will be logical.

If God created the universe as the Bible describes, we can predict that it will be logical to man’s mind, and this is exactly what we find. Dr. Jason Lisle observes that if God’s Word were not true, reality would make no sense:

“We would not have a good reason to believe in the preconditions of intelligibility; the basic reliability of memory and senses, laws of logic, uniformity of nature, morality, personal dignity and freedom, and so on. ...

“Rational reasoning involves using the laws of logic. ... For example, the statement ‘My car is in the garage and it is not the case that my car is in the garage’ is necessarily false by the law of non-contradiction. Any rational person would accept this law. But few people stop to ask, ‘Why is this law true? Why should there be a law of non-contradiction, or for that matter, any laws of reasoning?’ .. The Christian can answer these questions. ... According to Genesis, God has made us in His image (Gen. 1:26) and therefore we are to follow His example (Eph. 5:1). The laws of logic are a reflection of the way God thinks, and thus the way He expects us to think. The law of non-contradiction is not simply one person’s opinion of how we ought to think, rather it stems from God’s self-consistent nature. God cannot deny Himself (2 Tim. 2:13), and all truth is in God (John 14:6; Col. 2:3), therefore truth will not contradict itself. Since God is

constantly upholding the universe by His power (Heb. 1:3), the consistent Christian expects that no contradiction will ever occur in the universe.

“Laws of logic make sense in a Christian worldview. But other worldviews cannot account for them. For example, apart from the Bible, how could we know that contradictions are always false? We could only say that they have been false in our experience. But our experiences are very limited, and no one has experienced the future. ... Only in a biblical worldview can we know that contradictions cannot occur in reality; only the Christian has a basis for the law of non-contradiction, or laws of logic in general. ...

“How can the evolutionist account for absolute standards of reasoning like the laws of logic? In an accidental evolutionary universe, why would there be universal, unchanging standards? ...

“There cannot be a single universal set of laws of logic if there is more than one god. Therefore, no polytheistic religion can account for laws of logic” (Jason Lisle, *The Ultimate Proof of Creation*, pp. 40, 41, 52, 54, 56).

There will be a vast unbridgeable gulf between man and the animal kingdom; man alone will demonstrate high intelligence and worship God.

The Bible says that God made man in His own image and that man is not part of the animal kingdom. We would expect to find evidence for this, and this is precisely what we do find.

In *Hallmarks of Design* Stuart Burgess gives 10 characteristics that are unique to man: upright stature, skillful hands, unique skin, intricate language, intricate facial expressions, unique intellect, unique genetic code, unique reproduction, spiritual being, and delicate beauty (*Hallmarks of Design*, p. 164).

There will be evidence that men worshiped one God in the beginning and that this devolved into polytheism.

The Bible indicates that polytheism did not begin until nearly two millennium after man was created. Polytheism arose after the Flood at the Tower of Babel about 2200 B.C., and spread from there throughout the earth. Before the Flood men worshipped one supreme Almighty God, and this is what historians have found.

“In my opinion the history of the oldest civilization of man is a rapid decline from monotheism to extreme polytheism and widespread belief in evil spirits. It is in a very true sense the history of the fall of man” (Stephen Langdon, *Semitic Mythology*, Vol. 5, *Mythology of All Races*, 1931, p. xviii; Langdon was a renowned scholar at Oxford).

“A belief in a Supreme Being is to be found among all the peoples of the primitive culture...” (Wilhelm Schmidt, *Origin of the Idea of God*).

“There is a monotheism that precedes the polytheism of the Veda; and even in the invocations of the innumerable gods, the remembrance of a God, one and infinite, breaks through the mist of idolatrous phraseology like the blue sky that is hidden by passing clouds” (Max Muller, *History of Sanskrit Literature*, 1859, p. 559; Muller was a renowned Oxford Sanskrit scholar).

“Five thousand years ago the Chinese were Monotheists, but even then there was a struggle with nature-worship and divination” (James Legge, *The Religions of China*, cited from A.C. Gaebelein, *Christianity or Religion*, 1927, p. 44).

“From high cultures and low cultures the same picture emerges. It is a picture of a remarkably pure concept of the nature of God and His relation to man being gradually corrupted on the one hand by rationalizations which resulted from the gradual substitution of man’s own thinking in place of revelation and on the other hand

by superstition which stemmed from ignorance and forgetfulness or the original revelation” (Arthur Custance, *Evolution or Creation?* 1976, p. 131; Custance had an M.A. in oriental languages and a Ph.D. in anthropology).

“In the early ages of mankind, the existence of a sole and omnipotent Deity, who created all things, seems to have been the universal belief...” (J. Gardner Wilkinson, *The Ancient Egyptians*).

There will be evidence that human language is only a few thousand years old.

Modern archaeology has traced writing to the late 4th millennium B.C. (Joseph Naveh, *Origins of the Alphabets*, p. 6). This is exactly when the Bible says man’s history began.

There will be evidence that there was one original language.

The Bible says that there was one language in the beginning of man’s history, and the multiplicity of languages can be traced to God’s judgment on the Tower of Babel project.

One ancestral language is what many linguists and historians have argued for. It is called monogenesis and has been supported by Alfredo Trombetti, Morris Swadesh, John Bengtson, Merritt Ruhlen, and Joseph Greenberg, among others.

“Many modern day philologists attest to the likelihood of such an origin for the world’s languages. Alfredo Trombetti says he can trace and prove the common origin of all languages. Max Mueller also attests to the common origin” (Josh McDowell, *The New Evidence That Demands a Verdict*, p.105).

There will be evidence that man’s language was fully developed from its inception.

Instead of language growing more complex, it is growing increasingly simple. Ancient Chinese, which originated at least 4,000 years ago, had 6,000 characters, whereas modern

Chinese is greatly simplified. Ancient Sanskrit, which dates to at least 1,500 B.C., had up to 500 variations for each verb, whereas the modern languages that have developed from Sanskrit, such as Hindi and Bengali and Nepali, have only a few variations. (English typically has only five verb forms: do, does, did, done, doing.)

There will be evidence of Intelligent Design.

The evidence for this is everywhere. See the chapter “Icons of Creation.”

There will *not* be life elsewhere in the universe outside of Heaven, and certainly not any sort of evolving life.

The book of Genesis says that God made the earth for man’s habitation and the starry universe in relation to man’s earthly existence. The only other creatures mentioned in Scripture are the angels. The elect angels live in heaven, but they are also active on earth. Some of the angels followed Satan in his rebellion. Some of these are incarcerated (2 Peter 2:4) while others are active on earth (1 Peter 5:8). Beyond this, the Bible does not indicate that there is life elsewhere in the created universe.

After 45 years of intensive research by NASA, not a single sign of life has been detected. More than \$130 million has been spent on SETI (Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence) since 1960, with the current technology using 27 different telescopes scanning space in all directions for signs of life. This problem for evolutionists is known as the “Fermi Paradox.” Enrico Fermi, an atomic scientist, asked the question, “Where is everybody?”

Robert Naeye, editor-in-chief of *Sky & Telescope* magazine, says, “The sobering reality is that there is no observational evidence whatsoever for the existence of other intelligent beings anywhere in the universe” (“O.K., Where Are They?” *Astronomy*, July 1996, p. 36). Paul Davies’ book summing up the first half century of SETI is entitled *The Eerie Silence* (April 2010). Davies still thinks life might be found if SETI

could be ramped up, but he admits that so far, “not a whisper of an alien message has been received.”

There will be evidence that the world was made for man (Genesis 1:29).

This is exactly what we find. The world contains everything man needs. It has oxygen for breathing, water for drinking, food for sustenance, materials for clothing, fuel for light and heat, building materials for construction, substances for medicine, beauty, and a thousand other things for man's necessities and pleasure.

The fact that the world seems designed for man's use is so obvious that some evolutionists have called this the anthropic principle. But a world giving the appearance of having been designed for man makes no sense if it were a product of blind evolution.

Evolutionist Freeman Dyson said, “The universe in some sense must have known we were coming” (quoted by Judith Hooper, “Perfect Timing,” *New Age Journal*, Dec. 1985, p. 18).

All men will be of the same race.

According to the Bible, all men have the same blood (Acts 17:26); they come from the same original parents, Adam and Eve.

This is exactly what we find to be true. The differences between men are superficial, pertaining to such things as skin color and eye shape.

There will be evidence that human civilization began in the Mesopotamian region.

According to the Bible, after Noah's Flood in about 2350 B.C. human civilization flourished in the Mesopotamian region between the Tigris and Euphrates.

This is exactly what archaeologists have discovered. Great civilizations arose suddenly in this very region.

“Historians refer to ancient Mesopotamia as ‘the birthplace of civilization.’ The first civilization developed

in the southern region of Mesopotamia, called Sumer. ... By about 2800 B.C., most Sumerians lived in a city-state" (Shilpa Mehta-Jones, *Life in Ancient Mesopotamia*, p. 4).

In fact, the very cities mentioned in Genesis 10 have been unearthed by archaeologists. These include Babylon, Nineveh, Erech, Ur, and Calah.

Man's history will stretch back only several thousand years and will appear as a full-blown intelligent culture.

The Bible says that Adam's children built complex societies and were inventive from the very beginning, excelling in such things as metal working, designing musical instruments, and agriculture (Genesis 4:16-22). This early society, dating to about 4000 B.C., was destroyed in the Flood, but it was duplicated immediately thereafter by Noah's offspring beginning in about 2,500 B.C. The kingdom of Babylon was highly sophisticated, with the use of bricks and mortar for the construction of high towers, etc. (Genesis 10:8-12; 11:1-4).

This is confirmed by the discoveries of modern archaeology. Every ancient civilization seems to have popped into existence suddenly four to five thousand years ago.

The Egyptians had amazing mathematical and engineering skills. The Great Pyramid, built in about 2,500 B.C., contains over two million blocks of stone, each weighing about 2 1/2 tons. Its sides are 756 feet long and are set to the points of a compass to an accuracy of a small fraction of one degree (Don Stewart, *The Creation*, p. 150).

Ur of the Chaldees is one of the ancient cities mentioned in Genesis after the Flood. The city, dating to 2500 B.C., was excavated in the 1920s by a joint team of American and British archaeologists with Charles Woolley in charge. Werner Keller says, "Ur of the Chaldees was a powerful, prosperous colourful and busy capital city in the beginning of the second millennium B.C." (*The Bible as History*, p. 19). There were laws, courts, administrative offices, spinning mills. The broad irrigated fields of corn, barley, date-palms,

figs, etc. stretched as far as the eye could see and “could cheerfully bear comparison with Canadian wheat farms.” The city’s central tower was 75 feet high, built in stages of diminishing size of “gaily colored brick” on a foundation block 120 feet square. Each stage was covered with trees. It was surrounded with five temples that featured courtyards with flowing fountains. The houses were “handsome and comfortable.” Many of the citizens lived in “large two-storied villas with thirteen or fourteen rooms.” The houses were built of burnt brick and the walls coated with plaster and whitewashed. The citizens employed a variety of musical instruments to accompany their singing and plays. The graves of the kings contained golden drinking cups and goblets, wonderfully shaped jugs and vases, bronze tableware, mother of pearl mosaics, lapis lazuli and silver, harps and lyres and musical pipes, bright headdresses of flowers and leaves cut from gold and silver sheets, daggers with golden blades, and game boards.

The Mayans of Central America, 2000 B.C. and even earlier, had a written language, art, architecture, and could figure the length of a solar year to within 2/10,000 of a day. They calculated the length of each year at 365.2420 days, whereas modern astronomers calculate it at 365.2422 days.

There will be evidence of ancient religious towers throughout Mesopotamia.

The Bible says that after Noah’s Flood men built a great tower in Babylon as a religious and socio-political enterprise. Since the 19th century, archaeologists have unearthed the remnants of dozens of these towers, called ziggurats.

There will be beauty and pleasure.

According to the Bible, the Creator made beauty and a bounty of things for man to enjoy (Genesis 2:9 “pleasant to the sight”; Job 26:13 “he hath garnished the heavens”; 1 Timothy 6:17 “who giveth us richly all things to enjoy”).

This is exactly what we observe. The creation is not only functional, it is beautiful and fascinating and pleasurable. The sun doesn't just appear or disappear; it comes and goes with a glory that has never been captured fully by man's art! Snow doesn't just fall from the sky in haphazard chunks; it falls in flakes of glorious patterns. The earth's sky is a lovely, comforting blue, whereas it could be a depressing black like the moon's. The trees and shrubs and grass are glorious in their beauty, all shades of tranquil green, all sorts of pleasant habits, displaying flowers of every shape and every color in the rainbow. Even the lowly weeds have their glorious flowers. Jesus spoke of their beauty, saying that even Solomon in his kingly glory was not arrayed like the grass of the field.

Even in the depths of the sea and in outer space there is beauty. The Hubble Space Telescope has taken pictures of breathtaking beauty in outer space.

Bird feathers and butterflies have a complete range of color, which is produced by three types of pigment (carotenoid, porphyrins, and melanin) as well as magnificent systems involving intricate light reflection.

Even at the cellular level, there is beauty. Dr. Fazale Rana says, "... the most fascinating discovery made by scientific pioneers has little to do with the cell's structures or activities. Rather, it is the sheer beauty and artistry of the biochemical realm" (*The Cell's Design*, p. 16).

"God has made nature not only for our necessities, but also for our pleasures. He has not only made fields of corn, but he has created the violet and cowslip. Air alone would be sufficient for us to breathe, but see how He has loaded it with perfumes; bread alone might sustain life, but mark the sweet fruits with which nature's lap is brimming. The colours of flowers, the beauties of scenery, the music of birds, all show how the great Creator has cared for lawful gratification of every sense of man. Nor is it a sin to enjoy these gifts of heaven; but it would be folly to close one's soul to their charm" (Charles Spurgeon).

There will be barriers between the different kinds of plants and animals.

The Bible says 10 times in Genesis 1 that God made the plants and animals to reproduce “after his kind” (Gen. 1:11, 12, , 21, 24, 25).

This is evident in the fossil record and is called *stasis*. Creatures not only appear in the fossil record fully formed but also retain their form throughout their existence, even over supposed “millions of years.” The oldest bat in the fossil record, for example, is “modern” in form.

In breeding experiments, this is called “genetic homeostasis.” Through the process of artificial selection, corn has never become wheat; dogs, sheep; or reptiles, birds.

It is important to understand that the modern term *species* is not the same as the biblical *kinds* as used in Genesis 1, which is the Hebrew word *baramin*. Andrew Lamb of Creation Ministries writes: “The biblical kind often equates to the family level in the modern biological classification scheme, and sometimes to genus or order. Some excellent baraminology papers have appeared in recent issues of *Journal of Creation*” (“Sheep and Goats?” Creation Ministries International, 21007).

There will be interrelatedness, interdependence, symphony.

According to the Bible, God made the earth and the universe for man’s habitation, and this would predict that we will witness interrelatedness, interdependence, and symphony throughout the universe, which is exactly what we see.

Henry Zuill, Ph.D. in biology, observes:

“When we look broadly at the panorama of life and ecological relationships, we see that ecological complexity is built on layer upon layer of complexity, going all the way down through different hierarchical structural and organizational levels to the cell and even lower. ... we are

talking about an essential multi-species integrated service system--an entire integrated system. There seems to be no adequate evolutionary way to explain this. How could multiple organisms have once lived independently of services they now require?" (*In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, p. 67-69).

The examples of the harmony and integration of nature are endless. There is the finely-tuned universe. There is the earth's ecosystem, with its nitrogen cycle, water cycle, food chain, etc.

If evolution were true, we would expect to see chaos and disharmony rather than the beautiful integration that actually exists.

There will be evidence of man's fall and of God's curse on creation.

According to the Bible, man sinned against God by breaking His law and God judged both man and the creation of which man is the head. Man is a fallen sinner and the creation is "groaning and travailing" under God's curse (Romans 8:22).

This is precisely what we see. Human history and experience tells us that something is desperately wrong with man. He is incorrigibly evil, regardless of his environment and upbringing. He lies, steals, hates, envies, and covets. He is selfish, unkind, ungracious, and tends to violence, and nothing has proven successful in changing man's nature.

The earth, while filled with beauty and delightful things, shows every evidence of being under a curse. There is disease and death and entropy. There is nature "red in tooth and claw."

There will not be any trees older than about 4,500 years.

According to the Bible, the world was created six or seven thousand years ago and the global Flood destroyed all life from the earth about 4,500 years ago, so we would predict that the oldest living creatures will not be older than this.

The oldest trees on earth are the bristlecone pines in the White Mountains bordering California and Nevada. They are estimated to be about 4,600 years old.

It has been claimed that a group of Huon pines in Tasmania are more than 10,500 years old, but the dating was not based on actual ring counts but on pollen in a nearby lake. Traditional tree-ring dates give an age of no more than 4,000 years (Roger Patterson, *Evolution Exposed*, p. 173).

There will be great diversity and variety.

The Bible says that God made a great variety of plants and animals (Psa. 104:24-25).

It is not, therefore, surprising that there are many types of seeing and flying creatures (reptiles, mammals, birds, insects), but in light of evolution this would mean that the incredible miracle of sight and flight blindly evolved many times with countless varieties.

There will be evidence of a worldwide flood.

According to the Bible, a flood covered the earth with water during the days of Noah.

The two-volume *Earth's Catastrophic Past* documents the powerful evidence of a worldwide flood. The author, Andrew Snelling, obtained a Ph.D. in geology from the University of Sydney, Australia, in 1982, and was a principal investigator in the eight-year RATE (Radioisotopes and the Age of the Earth) project which critiqued evolutionary dating methods. Snelling made major contributions to the project in rock dating studies using radioisotopes and in studies of radiation halos and tracks in various minerals.

Volume 1 examines the biblical record of the Flood, comparing this record with modern scientific knowledge and theories. Dr. Snelling demonstrates that the Genesis record is reliable history that was authenticated by Christ's teaching. He shows that the reliability of the whole Bible depends on Genesis as literal history and answers the arguments that have been advanced, both by secularists, theological

modernists, and “evangelicals,” against a six-day creation and the global Flood. These arguments include the supposed lack of sufficient water to cover the mountains, the lack of space on the ark for all of the creatures, the problems with feeding so many animals, the post-flood animal distribution, and the similarity of the Babylonian flood accounts. Volume 1 also examines each of the six days of creation from a biblical and scientific viewpoint. Volume 1 concludes with a lengthy examination of the modern geological synthesis, including the geologic column, the precambrian column, and plate tectonics.

Volume 2 examines earth’s geology from the standpoint of the Genesis record, particularly the global Flood. Dr. Snelling documents the renewed recognition of catastrophism among scientists and the subsequent rejection of uniformitarianism. He examines the evidence for a global flood, including the massive fossil and coal beds. He demonstrates that the geologic column shows massive signs of rapid water-deposited strata and that the order of the strata deposited by the Flood would organize creatures according to how we see them in the fossil record. He shows the pitfalls in the radioactive dating methods, including potassium-argon, rubidium-strontium, samarium-neodymium, and uranium-thorium. He gives scientific evidence for a young earth, such as comets, the earth’s magnetic field, sea salt, erosion, sediments, volcanic activity and helium, radiohalos, and human population statistics. He answers various problems such as chalk and diatomite beds, coral reefs and limestone, evaporites, buried forests, coal beds, oil deposits, limestone caves and cave deposits, and ice ages.

Man will not find a solution to dying.

The Bible says that death is not a “natural” thing; it is the wages of sin (Romans 6:23). The Bible further indicates that man’s typical lifespan will be about 70 years (Psa. 90:10). On the basis of this teaching, we would predict that man will never find a solution to old age and dying, and it is obvious

that this is the case so far. Molecular biologist Bill Andrews is one of the scientists who are trying to find a genetic solution to old age. Andrews has vowed to extend the human life span to 150 years, which would be twice the length promised in Scripture. If the Bible is true, that will not happen. Victory over death will never be found in a pill, but it is found in Jesus Christ. “For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord” (Romans 6:23).

There will be a fear of death and a sense of an afterlife.

The Bible says that men fear it (Heb. 2:15), and this is exactly what we see. All men die, and men are generally fearful of dying and do everything they can to avoid it.

There will be evidence that man has a consciousness of God and a desire to have a relationship with Him.

The Bible says that God made man in His own image and for the purpose of walking in fellowship with him. After God made Adam, he communed with God before Eve was made.

Observation proves this prediction to be true. Man has a universal consciousness of God and a desire to know Him. This is witnessed by the multiplicity of religions that man has invented.

Man will have a conscience.

The Bible says that God put a conscience in man that speaks to him about right and wrong.

“Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another” (Romans 2:15).

This is true to man’s experience. Psychologists call it a “voice” and they try to quiet it by teaching men that they aren’t really under a divine moral mandate, but the fact is that the moral “voice” is a universal phenomenon.

Man will be guilt-ridden.

The Bible says that after man sinned against God, he was guilt-ridden. He hid from God and tried to cover his nakedness (Gen. 3).

This is exactly what we see in life. Men have invented many things, such as works religion and psychology, in an attempt to soothe their guilty consciences.

Man will be a master of blaming others for his errors.

The first thing Adam and Eve did when they sinned was blame others. Adam blamed his wife, and Eve blamed the serpent (Gen. 3:12-13).

The blame game has been played by all people throughout history. This trait is seen in children. The child typically tries to blame a sibling or someone or something other than himself. Those who work with prisoners know that it is rare for someone to own up to his own guilt and take responsibility for his actions.

Man will be conscious of his nakedness.

The Bible says that Adam and Eve were naked when God made them, but after they sinned they were conscious of this and ashamed of their nakedness (Gen. 2:25; 3:7).

It is interesting that man is the only “animal” that is aware of his nakedness and has generally throughout history covered it with at least some clothing. There have been exceptions, when tribes of men have become so degraded that they have lived in nakedness, but generally this has not been the case. From cave drawings to the artwork of ancient Mesopotamian civilization, men and women are depicted as clothed.

Evolution cannot explain how man became hairless (if he indeed evolved from the ape kingdom) or why he is conscious of his nakedness whereas apes are not.

The stars will differ in glory.

According to the Bible, God made the stars and planets and they “differ in glory” (1 Cor. 15:41).

This is scientifically true. Even the planets of our sun differ dramatically one from another in size, chemical composition, heat, rotation, moons, rings, and many other things, which makes no sense from an evolutionary viewpoint.

“The most popular theory holds that the solar system formed from an interstellar cloud of swirling gas and dust. If the sun, planets, and moons evolved from the same material, they should have many similarities. Yet each planet is unique.

“Since about 98 percent of the sun is hydrogen or helium, Earth, Mars, Venus, and Mercury should have similar composition. Instead, much less than 1 percent of these planets is hydrogen or helium.

“If the solar system evolved all planets should spin in the same direction, but Pluto and Venus rotate backwards, while Uranus is tipped on its side and rotates like a wheel.

“All moons in our solar system should orbit their planets in the same sense, but at least six have backward orbits. Furthermore, Neptune, Saturn and Jupiter have moons orbiting in both directions.

“Scientists have no answer as to why four planets have rings or why each planet is so unique” (*A Question of Origins* video presentation).

The life of the flesh will be in the blood.

According to the Bible, “the life of the flesh is in the blood” (Lev. 17:11).

This was written about 3,500 years ago, but it was not understood scientifically until recent times. For centuries doctors used “blood letting” as a healing method. George Washington, America’s first president, probably died prematurely because of this bogus practice. Modern medicine

has learned what the Bible has taught all along, that the life of the flesh is in the blood. The amazing system of blood vessels and capillaries carries the life-giving oxygen and other necessary elements to every part of the body via the amazing blood cell. The blood also forms a major part of the infection fighting and clotting systems, which are necessary for the “life of the flesh.”

The earth will be round.

According to the Bible, the earth is round (Isaiah 40:22).

This prediction is true according to modern science. Isaiah was writing about 2,700 years ago, at a time when men typically thought the earth was flat. Some have argued that Isaiah was not referring to a sphere but to a flat circle, but it appears to us that he was referring to the spherical shape of the earth and it has been interpreted that way by many august commentators. John Gill (1697-1791) said it refers to a “globe” and states, “for the earth is spherical or globular: not a flat plain, but round, hung as a ball in the air; here Jehovah sits as the Lord and Sovereign; being the Maker of it, he is above it, orders and directs its motion, and governs all things in it.” Nowhere does the Bible say or indicate that the earth is flat. The reference in Revelation 7:1 to the “four corners of the earth” do not refer in the context to corners as such but to the four directions of the wind.

The earth will be suspended in space.

According to the Bible, the earth is “hung on nothing” (Job 26:7).

Of course, modern science has confirmed this biblical “prediction.” Other ancient religious writings did not get this right. There were countless commonly-held myths about the earth sitting on the back of Atlas or a turtle or an elephant, etc.

The sun will make a circuit to the ends of the heaven.

The Bible says the sun's "going forth is from the end of the heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it" (Psalm 19:6).

This, of course, is what modern science has discovered. The sun makes a circuit around the center of the Milky Way galaxy at a rate of 486,000 miles per hour, with the planets revolving around the sun. When David wrote Psalm 19 three thousand years ago this was not known scientifically. For example, the Egyptians, in spite of their brilliant scientific achievements, believed that the sun was carried along in a boat that floated on a heavenly ocean.

There will be the fulfillment of Bible prophecies.

A final prediction we will mention is the fulfillment of Bible prophecy. If the Bible is the divinely-inspired Word of God, its prophecies will be fulfilled, and this is exactly what we see in history.

The many prophecies of Christ's first coming were fulfilled to the letter, including His birthplace in Bethlehem and the details surrounding His death. Psalm 22 and Isaiah 53, for example, prophesied that Christ would die by crucifixion but that His bones would not be broken, and that He would be mocked, soldiers would gamble for his garments, and He would be buried in the tomb of a rich man.

The prophecies of Deuteronomy 28 that described the entire course of Israel's history have been fulfilled to the letter. She rebelled against God's law, was scattered to the end of the earth, was persecuted wherever she journeyed, and she has come back to her land as predicted by Deuteronomy 30.

The prophecies of the course of the church age have also been fulfilled. In 2 Timothy 3-4, the Bible prophesied that professing Christians would turn away from the New Testament faith to follow fables and live according to their own lusts. Peter prophesied that false Christianity would bring great reproach to the cause of Christ (2 Peter 2:1-3).

These prophecies, written thousands of years ago, have been fulfilled. This is miraculous and it is irrefutable evidence of the divine origin of Scripture.

Questions For Evolutionists

How did everything come from nothing?

How did the matter for the Big Bang evolve?

How did an explosion produce order?

How did the fundamental laws of nature arise from chaos?

How did life spring from non-life?

How did intelligence arise from non-intelligence?

How did the first self-replicating living cell originate?

How did ATP (Adenosine TriPhosphate) evolve? The living cell is powered by ATP, which is produced in the cell's mitochondria by an amazing genetic motor called ATP Synthase. Without ATP there would be no biological life and without the ATP motor there would be no ATP.

Why do all breeding experiments demonstrate that species are stable and that the barriers that divide kinds cannot be breached?

Why are there not a multitude of clear examples of transitional organs and creatures in the fossil record rather than a handful of questionable ones?

Why do the supposed oldest creatures (such as trilobites) demonstrate bewildering complexity?

How can science answer the important questions of life, such as what is life? Where did it come from? What is its purpose? Is there a God, and if so what is He like? Is there a human soul, and if so where did it come from and does it exist after death?

Why is the universe filled with apparent design if there is no designer?

Why is the whole earth filled with rapidly fossilized creatures?

Why is the whole earth covered by facies or continuous layers of sedimentary rocks having similar characteristics? Respected professor of geology Derek Ager, in *The Nature of*

the Stratigraphic Record (1973), challenged geologists with “The Persistence of Facies.” “This very specific kind of sedimentary rock is found to extend in a continuous band from western Australia to Texas, Arkansas, Alabama, and Mississippi, then to Northern Ireland through England to become the famous white cliffs of Dover. It continues in northern France, Denmark, northern Germany, southern Scandinavia, to Poland, Bulgaria, and then to Georgia in the Soviet Union, and the south coast of the Black Sea” (Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 95).

How did the male-female reproductive system evolve?

How did the incredibly complex process of photosynthesis evolve?

How did plants exist over the millions of years that it took for photosynthesis to evolve?

How did the butterfly’s metamorphosis evolve?

How did long distance migration evolve?

How did the bat evolve sophisticated radar?

Why is the atom stable?

By what evolutionary process is information added to DNA in order to produce new organs and creatures?

How did thought evolve?

Where are the examples of beneficial mutations that create new biological systems?

Give one established fact supporting the evolution of one type of creature to another that is not based on evolutionary assumptions.

List one evolutionary dating method that is not based on evolutionary assumptions.

How can you be sure that all of the various “homo” categories (e.g., *Homo erectus*, *Homo ergaster*) are not *Homo sapiens* and that the various *australopithecines* (e.g., *affricanus*, *afarensis*) are not simply various types of apes with no evolutionary significance?

Why did evolution cease so that today we see a world system filled with stable, perfectly “adapted” species that have every appearance of intelligent design?

Darwinian Gods

“In tenacious commitment to atheism, naturalistic evolution fashions the marriage of the false modern gods of Mother Earth and Father Time as an inferior substitute for the great and awesome Creator of the Scriptures” (Jeremy Walter, Ph.D. in mechanical engineering, *In Six Days*, p. 18).

Even the most strident naturalistic evolutionist suspects that life is too mysterious in its origin and operation, too perfect and intricate and complex in its laws and functions, to have evolved blindly from nothing. They suspect there is Something beyond that which can be examined with a microscope or telescope.

But even when evolutionists admit that their theories can't really explain life, they typically refuse to believe in the Almighty Creator God. They would rather believe in any fairy tale than submit to the Creator God as revealed in Scripture and suffer the reproach of being a Bible-believing Christian. And the fairy tales they have invented are truly amazing.

The Intelligent Design (ID) movement is picking up steam and having an impact, in spite of all efforts of atheistic evolutionists in the “establishment” to censor every voice that questions Darwinism. I predict that Intelligent Design will continue to spread among evolutionists, but the “intelligence” behind the design will generally not be identified as the God of the Bible, but rather as some sort of mystical power within the pantheon of Darwinian New Age gods.

Consider some examples:

Nature

Nature is granted God-like qualities in evolutionary writings.

“We human beings are the subject of [Nature’s] experiments--the pawns of her great game” (Arthur Keith, cited by Roger Lewin, *Bones of Contention*, p. 42).

“Nature was making her great experiments to achieve the transmutation of the base substance of some brutal Ape into the divine form of man” (Elliot Smith, *Essays on the Evolution of Man*, 1924, p. 77).

How could “nature,” which according to Darwinism has no intelligence, make great experiments and play games? This is simply an attempt to replace God with something that has the same ability as God, all the while claiming that there is no God.

A Pantheistic Higher Power

Many evolutionists have fled to a pantheistic higher power to answer life’s mysteries. This evolutionary “God” is acceptable, because He is not man’s master and judge.

Charles Darwin’s grandfather **Erasmus Darwin**, who actually developed the fundamental elements of Darwinian evolution, worshipped God as “the vast Unknown” and “adored in the Temple of Nature” (Adrian Desmond, *Darwin*, pp. 5, 9). Erasmus preached the doctrine of evolution in a popular two-volume set of books entitled *Zoonomia; or, the Laws of Organic Life* (1794-96). He promoted the very concepts later popularized by the grandson Charles: natural selection, survival of the fittest, sexual selection, gradual transformation of species, homology, and vestigial organs. Erasmus believed that everything has risen from an original “living filament” which formed by “spontaneous vitality” in “the primeval ocean.”

Erasmus Darwin thought of himself as a free thinker, but his religion was nothing more than ancient goddess-earth worship. His book *The Temple of Nature* presented the doctrine of evolution under the guise of lessons he supposedly learned from the goddess Urania, Priestess of Nature.

One of Thomas Huxley's students, **C. Lloyd Morgan**, developed the concept of "Emergent Evolution," which saw "God" as "the Creative Source of evolution." Morgan believed that "all observable change is due to some form of Spiritual Activity," as a part of "a scheme" directed by God and leading upward toward God. This is a pantheistic higher power that is mysteriously working throughout the material world toward some unknown objective.

Alfred Russel Wallace, who co-founded the doctrine of natural selection with Charles Darwin, believed in a universe permeated with "cosmic intelligence." Wallace was the forerunner of evolutionists who have proposed a marriage of science and religion. He proposed "a reconciliation of Science with Theology." Wallace wrote:

"While admitting to the full extent of the agency of the same great laws of organic development in the origin of the human race as in the origin of all organized beings, there yet seems to be evidence of a Power which has guided the action of those laws in definite directions and for special ends. ... Let us not shut our eyes to the evidence that an Overruling Intelligence has watched over the action of those laws, so directing variations and so determining their accumulation, as finally to produce an organization sufficiently perfect to admit of, and even to aid in, the indefinite advancement of our mental and moral nature" (Wallace, "Sir Charles Lyell on Geological Climates and the Origin of Species," *Quarterly Review*, April 1867, pp. 393, 394).

While rejecting the sovereign Creator God of the Bible, Wallace believed in a pantheistic "Power," an "Overruling Intelligence" that is evolving everything toward an objective.

Ernst Haeckel, Darwin's most ardent German disciple, believed in a pantheistic Nature-God that energizes everything. While rejecting the "concept of the personal creator," Haeckel defined God as "the universal law of causality. ... the sum of all forces, thus also of all

matter” (Mario Di Gregorio, *From Here to Eternity*, p. 200). Haeckel conceived of “the unity of God within the whole of nature.” Matter and spirit are one.

Henry Fairfield Osborn, head of the American Museum of Natural History in New York City, hated the Genesis account of creation and biblical fundamentalism but believed in a God who is “with us, in us, and everywhere around us” (*The Earth Speaks to Bryan*, 1925, p. 86). He believed that a “purpose pervades all Nature, from nebula to man,” and he called it the “Wisdom and Spirit of the Universe.” This unknowable “Spirit” keeps everything in “everlasting motion.”

Theodosius Dobzhansky rejected the existence of a personal God, but was nonetheless called “a religious man” by geneticist Francisco Ayala. In a eulogy following Dobzhansky’s death, Ayala said:

“Dobzhansky held that in man, biological evolution has transcended itself into the realm of self-awareness and culture. He believed that mankind would eventually evolve into higher levels of harmony and creativity. He was a metaphysical optimist” (“Nothing in Biology Makes Sense Except in the Light of Evolution: Theodosius Dobzhansky,” *Journal of Heredity*, Vol. 68, No. 3, 1977, p. 3).

Dobzhansky wrote that the evolutionary process has “become conscious of itself” in man. This is the New Age pantheistic god that looks upon nature as self-aware and self-evolving.

Gaylord Simpson acknowledged that science cannot explain many things about life, so he allowed for a “hidden First Cause.”

“... the origin of that cosmos and the causal principles of its history remain unexplained and inaccessible to science. Here is hidden the First Cause sought by theology and philosophy. The First Cause is not known and I suspect it will never be known to living man. We

may, if we are so inclined, worship it in our own ways, but we certainly do not comprehend it" (Simpson, *The Meaning of Evolution*).

Simpson's "hidden First Cause" was deemed acceptable, in contrast to Almighty God, because man is not responsible to such a vague, unknowable thing.

Stephen Jay Gould allowed for a "clock-winding god." This is similar to the Deist principle of an absentee god.

"... no intervening spirit watches lovingly over the affairs of nature (though Newton's clock-winding god might have set up the machinery at the beginning of time and then let it run)" (Stephen Jay Gould, "In Praise of Charles Darwin," *Discover* magazine, Feb. 1982; also printed as a chapter in *Darwin's Legacy*, edited by Charles Hamrum, 1983, pp. 6-7).

George Wald, a rabid Darwinist who "used to state that he didn't even like to use the word 'God' in a sentence," eventually bought into a form of pantheism because of science's inability resolve the mysteries of life.

"There are two major problems rooted in science, but unassimilable as science, consciousness and cosmology. ... The universe wants to be known. Did the universe come about to play its role to empty benches?" (Dietrick Thomsen, "A Knowing Universe Seeking to Be Known," *Science News*, Feb. 19, 1983).

Jeremy Rifkin described the New Age evolutionary god as follows:

"Evolution is no longer viewed as a mindless affair, quite the opposite. It is mind enlarging its domain up the chain of species. ... In this way one eventually ends up with the idea of the universe as a mind that oversees, orchestrates, and gives order and structure to all things" (*Algeny*, 1983, p. 188, 195).

Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (1881-1955) is a prime example of the bridge between Darwinian evolution and New

Age mysticism. Teilhard (pronounced *tay-yar*) was a Jesuit priest and an evolutionary paleontologist who believed that “man descended from monkeys” (*The New York Times*, March 19, 1937). He was one of the discoverers of the so-called Peking Man. But Teilhard didn’t believe in blind evolution. He was “a leading proponent of *orthogenesis*, the idea that evolution occurs in a directional, goal driven way.” He called it “sacred evolution.”

Teilhard taught that God is the consciousness of the universe, that everything is one, and that everything is evolving in greater and greater enlightenment toward an ultimate point of perfection. He called this perfection CHRIST and THE OMEGA POINT. To Teilhard, all men’s souls constitute the “soul of the world” that is evolving toward an “ultimate convergence in perfection on Omega and the Christ” (Anne Bancroft, *Twentieth-Century Mystics*, p. 55).

Thus, man is supposedly part of the divine and will eventually merge with it.

Teilhard called his doctrine the Law of Complexity, claiming that the Omega Point is drawing the universe to itself so that it is being guided toward ever higher states of consciousness. He described the Omega Point as a divine personal intellectual being that is outside of the framework of evolution and that is guiding evolution.

Teilhard taught that evolution has progressed in three stages, the geosphere, the biosphere, and the noosphere. The geosphere (inanimate matter) was formed first, followed by the biosphere (biological life). The **NOOSPHERE** is the “sphere of human thought” or “collective consciousness” that is now evolving toward perfection.

In *The Phenomenon of Man* (1968) Teilhard claimed that man is on the verge of an evolutionary leap in consciousness similar to that allegedly achieved when man emerged from the animal kingdom. He “believed the new consciousness would be similar to mystical enlightenment in that it was

likely to have collective and cosmic elements which would have the effect of drawing individuals closer to God" (*The Aquarian Guide to the New Age*).

New Agers such as Barbara Hubbard have latched onto this doctrine as foundational to their program.

Teilhard was a mystic and described his practice of meditation as "going down into my innermost self, to the deep abyss" (*The Divine Milieu*, p. 76). He said: "At each step of the descent a new person was disclosed within me of whose name I was no longer sure, and who no longer obeyed me." At the end of the journey he found "a bottomless abyss at my feet."

This is a loud warning to those who have ears to hear. Though the mystic believes that he is touching light and truth through contemplative practices, in reality he is fellowshiping with darkness and devils. Who were these "persons" that were distinct from Teilhard himself and that did not obey him? From a biblical perspective, we conclude that he was communicating with demons.

Teilhard said he was led along by a spirit all his life.

"Ever since my childhood an enigmatic force had been impelling me" (Teilhard, *The Heart of the Matter*, 1979, p. 53).

Because of his communion with devils through mysticism, Teilhard rejected the Christ of the Bible and salvation through Christ's blood atonement, and adopted a pantheistic view of God.

"[T]he Cross still stands ... But this on one condition, and one only: that it expand itself to the dimensions of a New Age, and cease to present itself to us as primarily (or even exclusively) the sign of a victory over sin" (*Christianity and Evolution*, pp. 219-220).

"I believe that the Messiah whom we await, whom we all without any doubt await, is the universal Christ; that is to

say, the Christ of evolution” (*Christianity and Evolution*, p. 95).

“What I am proposing to do is to narrow that gap between pantheism and Christianity by bringing out what one might call the Christian soul of Pantheism or the pantheist aspect of Christianity” (*Christianity and Evolution*, p. 56).

The New Age merger of scientific evolution with a pantheistic or panentheistic god has spread widely in our day. It is even promoted in the Spitzer Hall of Human Origins at the American Museum of Natural History. The displays depict man as a product of blind Darwinian evolution and brashly contradict the Bible’s account of creation, but a video presentation features prominent evolutionists claiming that science and religion are friends.

Francis Collins, director of the Human Genome Project, says:

“I’m a scientist that believes the tools of science are the way to understand the natural world and one needs to be rigorous about that. But I’m also a believer in a personal God. I find the scientific worldview and the spiritual worldview to be entirely complementary. And I find it quite wonderful to be able to have both of those worldviews existing in my life in a given day, because each illuminates the other” (video presentation at the American Museum of Natural History’s Spitzer Hall of Human Origins).

This might sound respectful toward “religion,” but in fact it is a bold repudiation of the Bible, because the Bible refuses to speak only about “religious things.” The Bible begins with a plain account of how the material universe was made, so it refuses to leave such things to “science.” And if the Bible is wrong about the material universe there is no reason to believe it is right about anything else and no reason to “respect” its teachings on any other subject.

Michael Dowd, author of *Thank God for Evolution: The Marriage of Science and Religion* (2008), identifies God as “a personification of one or more deeply significant dimensions of reality.” He says, “Getting right with God means coming into right relationship with our planet and all its gloriously diverse species and cultures.” He says that he had a mystical enlightenment during a course on “The New Catholic Mysticism” operated by the United Church of Christ. He wept as he saw “the scientific story of the Universe” as a “sacred epic.” He foresees a time when “religious leaders get their guidance and inspiration from humanity’s common creation story [Darwinism] and teach and preach the discoveries of science as God’s word.”

Dowd praises the “new atheists” such as Richard Dawkins and Christopher Hitchens, and they, in turn, have responded somewhat sympathetically to his approach. There is a merger ongoing.

Panspermia And Aliens

From time to time, evolutionary scientists have theorized that life on earth came from outer space.

The doctrine is not new. It was held by **Benoit de Maillet** in the 18th century. He believed that germs from space fell into earth’s oceans and grew into fish, which became amphibians, reptiles, and mammals. He was convinced that there are lots of such evolving germs in space.

William Thomson (Lord Kelvin) proposed a similar idea in the 19th century. Thomson, president of the London Royal Society for five years, formulated the dissipation of energy principle that is summarized as the second law of thermodynamics. He invented devices that made the first transatlantic telegraph cable possible. His sounding device for determining the depth of the sea from a ship was in use for more than a century. His research in physics helped prepare the way for wireless telegraphy. He is buried in Westminster Abbey beside Sir Isaac Newton.

In 1864, Thomson told the Royal Society of Edinburgh that life came to this planet from outer space. He said, “The hypothesis that life originated on this earth through moss-grown fragments from the ruins of another world may seem wild and visionary; all I maintain is that it is not unscientific.” In 1881, he repeated this idea before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, saying that life was carried to earth on “countless seed-bearing meteoritic stones.”

“Hence, and because we all confidently believe that there are at present, and have been from time immemorial, many worlds of life besides our own, we must regard it as probable in the highest degree that there are countless seed-bearing meteoric stones moving about through space. If at the present instance no life existed upon this earth, one such stone falling upon it might, by what we blindly call natural causes, lead to its becoming covered with vegetation” (Thomson, cited from Fred Hoyle, *Evolution from Space*, p. 38).

This statement represents a doctrine of blind faith. There is *no* scientifically established evidence that there are many worlds of life besides our own or that there are countless seed-bearing meteors moving about space or that such a meteor landing on earth could produce the bewildering variety of life that currently exists. These men mock faith in the Almighty Creator God of the Bible as blind, but they are the ones who stumble in gross darkness and are captured by fables.

In 1907, **Svante Arrhenius** of Germany claimed in his book *Worlds in the Making* that life wafts through space by means of “spores” that colonize any hospitable planet they find. He called this “**PANSPERMIA**.” He hypothesized that the living spores are transported by star light.

Sir Fred Hoyle (d. 2001), noted British astronomer, also held the proposition that alien life enters earth from outer space. He believed that this is responsible for epidemic

outbreaks and new diseases and by this means various new life forms have been seeded on earth.

He believed that the earth has been repeatedly seeded with alien life, and that the seeding is a product of intelligent design by some unknown higher power with “an overt plan of planetary invasion” (*Evolution from Space*, p. 126).

“In our view the arrival at the Earth of living cells, and of fragments of genetic material more generally, is a continuing ongoing process which does the job that is usually attributed to Darwinism” (*Evolution from Space*, p. 51).

The thing that led Hoyle to the conclusion that life on earth came from aliens is his recognition that chemical evolution (molecules to man) is impossible. He wrote:

“If one proceeds directly and straightforwardly in this matter, without being deflected by a fear of incurring the wrath of scientific opinion, one arrives at the conclusion that BIOMATERIALS WITH THEIR AMAZING MEASURE OR ORDER MUST BE THE OUTCOME OF INTELLIGENT DESIGN. No other possibility I have been able to think of” (“Evolution from Space,” Omni Lecture, Royal Institution, London, January 12, 1982).

As for the Darwinian idea that life could arise in a primordial organic soup on earth, Hoyle called it “nonsense of a high order.”

Hoyle was right about this, but he refused to follow this logic to the personal God of the Bible. In fact, he hated that God. He wrote that the “biggest thing going for Darwinism was that it finally broke the tyranny in which Christianity had held the minds of men for many centuries” (*Evolution from Space*, p. 133). He called the concept of one God “ludicrous” (p. 143).

Instead, Hoyle went on a misguided search for aliens and ended up in pure mythology. He concluded that there are hierarchies of “gods” in the universe, which is similar to the

ancient Gnostic concept. He wrote of “many levels of intelligence rising upwards from ourselves” (*Evolution from Space*, p. 31). He called these “cosmic space agency experts” (p. 110) and hypothesized that they have “domains of influence” (p. 113).

Of course, in regard to the mystery of the origin of life, Hoyle’s “theory” solved nothing. It merely put the problem off to another time and place. What it did do, though, was provide a way to get rid of that pesky Creator God of the Bible to whom every man is accountable.

Astronomer **Chandra Wickramasinghe**, director of the Cardiff Centre for Astrobiology, agrees with Hoyle’s principle. They co-authored the book *Evolution from Space*. Wickramasinghe says:

“Comets arriving at the Earth from the 100 billion-strong Oort cometary cloud of our solar system brought the first life onto our planet some 3,800 million years ago. Evolution of life on the Earth was directed by the continued arrival of cometary bacteria, bacteria which must still be arriving at this present time” (interview with Robert Britt, “Panspermia Q and A: Leading Proponent Chandra Wickramasinghe,” Space.com, Oct. 27, 2000, http://www.space.com/searchforlife/chandra_sidebar_001027.html).

This is myth upon myth. The Oort cloud is an evolutionary fable without a scintilla of evidence. It was invented to answer the problem that comets point to a young solar system. If the solar system is as old as evolution claims, icy comets should have melted away by now in their journeys around the sun. No problem, evolutionists reply; there must be a place where comets are continually created. Dyed-in-the-wool evolutionists always have a new trick to pull out of the Darwinian hat. They can say with the late “Reverend Ike” “You can’t lose with the stuff I use.”

Francis Crick (d. 2004), co-discoverer of the DNA’s double helix construction, and **Leslie Orgel** (d. 2007), a British

chemist, proposed the “theory” of “directed panspermia” in the 1970s. They suggested that the seeds of life were planted on earth by extraterrestrials. Crick, who won the Nobel Prize for his work in the discovery of the structure of DNA, theorized that perhaps an alien civilization facing annihilation, or hoping to create living planets for future colonization, built a spaceship to send bacteria to the earth. He published this view in the book *Life Itself* (1981).

While believing in aliens, Crick hated the Bible and suggested that Christianity “should not be taught to young children.” He described himself as a skeptic with “a strong inclination towards atheism.” He denied the existence of man’s eternal soul and was an advocate for the establishment of Darwin Day as a British national holiday. When Churchill College, Cambridge, elected to build a Christian chapel (even though the Christianity it represents is exceedingly liberal), Crick resigned his fellowship in protest. He is a poster child for the Bible’s contention that men who are unthankful to God and professing themselves to be wise become fools (Romans 1:22).

Astrobiologist **Richard Shapiro** also suspects that life began with aliens in outer space. Shapiro is Professor Emeritus and Senior Research Scientist in the Department of Chemistry at New York University. He has a Ph.D. in organic chemistry from Harvard and postdoctoral training in DNA chemistry at Cambridge. In *Origins: A Skeptic’s Guide to the Creation of Life on Earth* (1986), Shapiro argues that life is too complex to have evolved through any of the standard proposed evolutionary processes and speculates that life originated in outer space.

The avowed atheist **Richard Dawkins** said in an interview with Ben Stein that he suspects that life was seeded on earth by aliens. This was published in the documentary *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed*. Dawkins, author of *The God Delusion*, is an atheist on a ridiculous rampage against the Almighty. He calls the God of the Bible “the most unpleasant

character in all fiction” and a “capriciously malevolent bully.” Like the late Francis Crick, Dawkins believes that Christianity should not be taught to children.

Ben Stein asked Dawkins, “Who did create the heavens and the earth? How did it start?”

Dawkins replied, “No one knows how it started. We know the kind of event it must have been for the origin of life. It was the origin of the first self-replicating molecule.”

Stein asked, “What do you think is the possibility that Intelligent Design might turn out to be the answer to some issues in genetics?”

To this Dawkins gave the following amazing reply:

“It could be that at some earlier time somewhere in the universe a civilization evolved by, probably some kind of Darwinian means, to a very, very high level of technology and designed the form of life they seeded on to this planet. That is a possibility and an intriguing possibility, and I suppose it is possible that you might find evidence for that if you look at the details of biochemistry and molecular biology you might find a signature of some sort of designer. And that designer could well be a higher intelligence from elsewhere in the universe. That higher intelligence would itself have had to have come about by some ultimately explicable process. It couldn’t have just jumped into existence spontaneously.”

So Richard Dawkins admits that life couldn’t have just jumped into existence from non-life as Darwinian evolution claims and that there *IS* evidence for an intelligent designer. But since he has rejected the God of the Bible, he launches out into the never-never land of “aliens.” And this is the same man that mocks those who believe in God. Indeed, no man is more blind than he who is *willfully ignorant* (2 Peter 3:3-8).

There is absolutely zero scientific evidence for the “theory” of aliens or panspermia. Hands-on research in outer space has been going on for decades, but neither Russia nor the USA have found evidence of living spores floating in space.

There is plenty of hypothesizing and there are questionable sightings and assumptions, but no *evidence* that would stand up in a court of law.

As for “moss-grown fragments” or “seed-bearing meteorites” bringing life to earth, there is no evidence for that either.

In 1962, “organized elements” were discovered in the Orgueil meteorite that had fallen to earth in southern France in 1864. These were announced as evidence that life came to earth from outer space, but they turned out to be either mineral crystals or pollen or fungal spores that had contaminated the sample. The “life fossils” turned out to be highly questionable at best, and this has been true every time fossilized “life” has been “discovered” in meteorites.

In 1965, a fragment of the Orgueil meteorite was found to have seeds embedded in it, but though there was great initial excitement, it turned out to be a hoax. Someone had glued seeds from the rush plant into the meteorite fragment and camouflaged it using coal dust. The “glassy layer” that was thought at first to have protected the seed, turned out to be glue.

There was a claim in 1996 that a meteorite called “Allan Hills” found in Antarctica contained “fossilized trails of microbial life that originated on Mars.” Again, it is highly questionable at best. This allegation has been strongly discounted by other scientists who say that the “fossilized microbial life” is nothing of the sort or that it was introduced after the meteorite fell to earth. Much has been made of this by proponents of panspermia, but you can’t prove a proposition with evidence this ridiculously shaky!

There have been a few other reports of fossilized bacteria in meteorites, but all such reports are highly questionable even within the scientific community.

A study by researchers at Caltech, Vanderbilt, and McGill universities in the 1990s claimed that had there been Martian bacteria in the Allan Hills meteorite it could have survived

the fiery entry through earth's atmosphere. This study claims that the interior of the rock only reached 105 degrees Fahrenheit (40 degrees Celsius). The scientists conclude that "space rocks are capable of acting as vessels for the transport of organisms around the solar system" (Robert Britt, "Mars Rock Cool Enough to Transport Life to Earth," Space.com, Oct. 26, 2000).

This, though, is still purely hypothetical. No established evidence that life has actually come to earth from outer space has ever been found and it is still not certain that living bacteria could survive the entry through earth's atmosphere.

In fact, the European Space Agency strapped basalt and granite disks riddled with bacteria to the heat shield of an unmanned spacecraft, Foton-M3. After orbiting the earth for 12 days, it crashed to earth. The bacteria didn't survive. Rene Demets of the European Space Agency said that real meteorites would provide more protection, but that is still a mere proposition and evolutionary wishful thinking.

The fact is that no living bacteria coming to earth from outer space have ever been found. And living bacteria have never been found anywhere in outer space.

In 2002, it was reported that glycine (the simplest amino acid) had been discovered in interstellar clouds, but it turned out to be untrue ("L. Snyder, "A Rigorous Attempt to Verify Interstellar Glycine," *Astrophysical Journal*, 2005).

Some pro-panspermia web sites take the stance that it is a fact that living bacteria have been found in outer space and have survived entrance through the earth's atmosphere. They can be very convincing, but when you examine their "evidence" it is found to be questionable in the extreme. It's all smoke and mirrors based on evolutionary assumptions.

One thing is certain, if life were to have been brought to earth as a germ on a meteorite, that really answers nothing from an evolutionary point of view. It doesn't answer how that germ came into existence in the first place. And it doesn't answer how that germ could become a man.

Magic

One evolutionist has boldly proposed that the assembly of cellular life is the product of magic:

“Over at BioLogos, biologist Kathryn Applegate has offered what has to be one of the more creative alternatives to the intelligent design of the bacterial flagellum: Magic. [‘Self-Assembly of the Bacterial Flagellum: No Intelligence Required,’ *The Biologos Forum*, Aug. 19, 2010] I’m not kidding. Applegate readily concedes biochemist Michael Behe’s point that the flagellum ‘looks and functions just like the outboard motor, a machine designed by intelligent human engineers. So conspicuous is the resemblance that it seems perfectly logical to infer a Designer for the flagellum.’ But, wait, she says: ‘The bacterial flagellum may **look** like an outboard motor, but there is at least one profound difference: the flagellum assembles spontaneously, **without the help of any conscious agent**.’ (emphasis added) Acknowledging that ‘the self-assembly of such a complex machine almost defies the imagination,’ Dr. Applegate assures her readers that this is not really a problem because ‘Natural forces work like magic.’ Presto, chango, something appears!” (“Behe Critic on Bacterial Flagellum,” *Evolution News & Views*, Aug. 25, 2010).

Gaia And Other Goddesses

Some evolutionists invoke goddesses and the sacredness of the earth.

As we have seen, Charles Darwin’s grandfather, Erasmus, who is the actual father of Darwinian evolution, wrote a long poem that is purported to be the doctrine of the goddess Urania, priestess of nature. Called “The Temple of Nature,” the poem borrows from ancient paganism and is pure goddess-earth worship.

In more recent times, evolutionists have proposed the Gaia theory, which looks upon the earth itself as a living entity, or

something very much like a living entity. *Gaia* was a Greek goddess.

The “theory” was formulated in the 1960s by James Lovelock, a research scientist who has worked for NASA. It was promoted through articles and a 1979 book *Gaia: A New Look at Life on Earth*. The Gaia doctrine sees the amazing interlocking systems of life on earth as being guided by a metaphysical force that is identified with the earth itself.

Lovelock defines Gaia as “a complex entity involving the Earth’s biosphere, atmosphere, oceans, and soil; the totality constituting a feedback or cybernetic system which seeks an optimal physical and chemical environment for life on this planet.”

Though many evolutionary scientists have vehemently rejected it, the “theory” has gained proponents. Dr. Lynn Margulis, a noted microbiologist, is a proponent of Gaia. She dedicated a portion of her book *The Symbiotic Planet* to this proposition.

The first Chapman Conference on the Gaia Hypothesis was held in 1989 in San Diego, organized by climatologist Stephen Schneider. The second was held in Valencia, Spain, in 2000, and the third in Arlington, Virginia, in 2006. In addition to Lovelock and Margulis, speakers included Tyler Volk, director of the Program in Earth and Environmental Science at New York University; Thomas Lovejoy, president of the Heinz Center for Science, Economics and the Environment; Robert Correll of the Atmospheric Policy Program of the American Meteorological Society; and J. Baird Callicott, environmental ethicist.

Smarting under the criticism of some of his fellow evolutionists for inventing a “neo-Pagan New Age religion,” Lovelock backed away from some of his earlier statements and has said that he does not believe that “planetary self-regulation is purposeful, or involves foresight or planning by the biota.” Margulis, though, agrees with Lovelock’s earlier conclusion that the earth’s surface is “best regarded as alive.”

Whether Lovelock himself pursues Gaia to its logical conclusion--that there is an intelligent metaphysical entity beyond biological life--we believe that some type of New Age pantheism represents the future of evolution. Most men cannot be satisfied with the idea that we are the product of blind chance and that there is no metaphysical aspect and no purpose to life. Even the most brash atheist does not live his life consistently with that principle. A man might say that he believes he is an evolved worm, but he does not consider himself a worm and does not want to be treated like a worm. Men want something more, but having rejected the Creator God of the Bible, they are left to grope in the darkness of their own vain imagination and to be captured by demonic myths. The “god of this world” is leading the evolutionary crowd along by the nose, and there is no doubt that they will eventually worship the antichrist as “god.”

The Anthropic Principle

Closely associated with Gaia is the Anthropic Principle. According to this doctrine, the universe “is conscious in some sense and is inseparably tied in with the existence of human life on earth” (Henry Morris, *The Long War Against God*, p. 124).

This doctrine is held by many scientists such as P.A. Dirac, Robert Dicke, Freeman Dyson, John Wheeler, Richard Gott, Brandon Carter, Paul Davies, and George Wald.

Following are some quotes that describe the doctrine:

“The universe in some sense must have known we were coming” (Freeman Dyson, quoted by Judith Hooper, “Perfect Timing,” *New Age Journal*, Dec. 1985, p. 18).

“The universe wants to be known. Did the universe come about to play its role to empty benches”? (George Wald, Nobel prize winner, Harvard University, cited by Dietrick Thomsen, “A Knowing Universe Seeking to Be Known,” *Science News*, Feb. 19, 1983, p. 124).

“The universe is no longer seen as a machine, made up of a multitude of objects, but has to be pictured as one indivisible, dynamic whole whose parts are essentially interrelated and can be understood only as patterns of a cosmic process” (Fritjof Capra, *The Turning Point*, 1982, pp. 77, 78).

Self-Organization (The Complexity Theory)

Another Darwinian god is the myth of self-organization or the “complexity theory.” It has been championed by Stuart Kauffman, founder of the University of Calgary’s Institute for Biocomplexity and Informatics; Stuart Newman, professor of cell biology at New York Medical College; Stuart Pivar, and others.

According to this doctrine, life spontaneously organized itself into ordered patterns. “Kauffman proposes that chemicals in the prebiotic soup organized themselves into complex metabolic pathways.” Supposedly one type of complex system can switch to another type through “perturbations” (Michael Behe, *Darwin’s Black Box*).

Kauffman believes that the biosphere constructs itself using sunlight and free energy and that the universe is “ceaselessly creative” (Suzan Mazur, *The Altenberg* 16, p. 55).

Kauffman has the New Age goal of creating “safe spiritual space across all our traditions” and treating “all in our global culture as sacred.”

Stuart Newman theorizes that “all 35 animal phyla **self-organized** by the time of the Cambrian explosion half a billion years ago using dynamical patterning modules (DPMs), a pattern language that called up certain physical processes and enabled highly plastic single-celled organisms to leap into multicellularity and build cavities, layers of tissue, segments, extremities, primitive hearts and even eyes” (Mazur, pp. 12, 13).

Newman says:

“When they [single cells] found themselves together in a multicellular-scale structure, their combined effect was to make segmentation all-but-inevitable. In fact, we know that modern-day embryos, including those of humans, still use these ancient ‘generic’ physical processes to form their segmented backbones. ... At the point when the modern animal body plans first emerged [half a billion years ago] just about all of the genes that are used in modern organisms to make embryos were already there. They had evolved in the single-celled world but they weren’t doing embryogenesis. What did it take to get them to do embryogenesis? It took a change in scale. What led that change in scale is that, possibly due to alterations in external conditions, cells became sticky. And once they became sticky, you had multicellular organisms, and mobilization of the self-organizing physical processes of mesoscale materials” (Mazur, p. 52).

Other than the sticky cells statement, my favorite Newman quote is the following:

“Cells have these clocks inside of them, these oscillations. And in the single cell world an oscillation just periodically changes the state of a cell. But in the multicellular state, the oscillation can lead to spatial segmentation. You’re mobilizing things that existed before, that evolved in the single cell world but then when they meet up with the physics of mesoscale (middle scale) materials, you get all these morphogenetic processes--all these form-producing processes come into play” (Mazur, p. 127).

If you remove the evolutionary assumptions from these statements you are left with absolutely nothing but a ridiculous just-so story. How did incredibly complicated living cells appear from non-life? How did they “find themselves” together? By what scientific process is cellular segmentation “inevitable”? What scientifically established evidence is there that animals evolved from a single cell? How did cells become *sticky*? What scientific evidence is

there that stickiness has anything to do with the creation of multicellular organisms? How, scientifically, does the oscillation of a cell change to spatial segmentation? How do things that supposedly evolved in a single-celled world “mobilize” into new, incredibly complicated forms? What are the evolutionary form-producing processes that have been scientifically demonstrated even to the level of hypothesis?

Stuart Pivar describes the self-organization of life as “a slow-moving, elongated smoke ring” (Mazur, p. 94). He theorizes that every living creature self-organized from “the same toroidal germ plasm” and he has created computerized “animated blueprints” to depict this. Pivar says that his torus model of evolution has been called “plausible, publishable and worthy of further investigation” by Dimitar Sassellov, Director, Harvard Initiative for the Study of the Origins of Life; theoretical biologist Brian Goodwin; Nobel laureate Murray Gell-Mann; biologist Stan Salthe; NASA origins of life scientist Robert Hazen, and MIT’s Noam Chomsky (Mazur, p. 96). But all of the top scientists in the world agreeing that something is “plausible” does not add up to one scintilla of scientific evidence!

The “theory” is largely based upon mathematical computer modeling. It is garbage in (evolutionary assumptions), garbage out (modeling predictions).

Biologist Michael Behe, who understands the complexity of life at the cellular level, remarks:

“... the complexity theory began as a mathematical concept to describe the behavior of some computer programs, and **its proponents have not yet succeeded in connecting it to real life**. Rather, the chief mode of argumentation so far has been for proponents to point to the behavior of a computer program and assert that computer behavior resembles the behavior of a biological system. ...

“No proponent of complexity theory has yet gone into a laboratory, mixed a large variety of chemicals in a test

tube, and looked to see if self-sustaining metabolic pathways spontaneously organize themselves. If they ever do try such an experiment, they will merely be repeating the frustrating work of origin-of-life scientists who have gone before them--and who have seen that complex mixtures yield a lot of muck on the sides of a flask, and not much else.

“Indeed, some proponents see great significance in the fact that they can write short computer programs which display images on the screen that resemble biological objects such as a clam shell. The implication is that it doesn’t take much to make a clam. But a biologist or biochemist would want to know, if you opened the computer clam, would you see a pearl inside? If you enlarged the image sufficiently, would you see cilia and ribosomes and mitochondria and intracellular transport systems and all the other systems that real, live organisms need? To ask the question is to answer it. **In the article, Kauffman observes that ‘At some point artificial life drifts off into someplace where I cannot tell where the boundary is between talking about the world--I mean, everything out there--and really neat computer games and art forms and toys.’ More people are beginning to think that the drifting point occurs very early. ...**

“Complexity theory may yet make important contributions to mathematics, and it may still make modest contributions to biochemistry. But it cannot explain the origin of the complex biochemical structures that undergird life. It doesn’t even try” (*Darwin’s Black Box*, chapter 9, “Intelligent Design”).

Autoevolution

A view akin to “self-organization” is “autoevolution.” This term was coined by Antonio Lima-De-Faria, author of *Molecular Evolution and the Organization of the Chromosome*.

He believes that there have been four separate stages of autoevolution: elementary particles, chemical elements, minerals, and biology.

“Evolution starts when the universe is born. And this is not a loose process since the elementary particles already show specific ancestors and specific rules of evolution. Later the chemical elements of the periodic table also display an ordered and well-defined evolution. Still later, the minerals also undergo an evolution of their own. These three separate evolutions preceded the biological one. ... I felt compelled to coin the word autoevolution. It describes the transformation phenomenon which is inherent to the construction of matter and energy. This consequently produced and canalized the emergence of forms and functions” (Lima-de-Faria, *Evolution with Selection: Form and Function by Autoevolution*, 1988, p. 18, cited from Suzan Mazur, *The Altenberg* 16, pp. 81, 82).

Lima-de-Faria believes that everything from atoms to humans autoevolved. He says that life “has no beginning; it is a process inherent to the structure of the universe” (Mazur, p. 83).

That is a LOT of self-creating by a mindless universe!

But this man would not dream of believing in the Almighty Creator of Scripture. That would be extreme and unscientific.

The Indeterminate Sea Of Potentiality

In his lectures on astronomy at the University of Oregon James Schombert says,

“... the Universe probably derived from an indeterminate sea of potentiality that we call the quantum vacuum, whose properties may always remain beyond our current understanding” (<http://zebu.uoregon.edu/~js/ast123/lectures/lec15.html>).

It takes far more “faith” to believe in the existence of an indeterminate sea of (non-intelligent) potentiality than it does to believe in an Almighty Creator.

Multiverse

The multiverse proposition, also called megaverse and the Landscape, purports that our universe is only one of an infinite number of universes, none of the others being observable. The laws of nature that we find in our universe are not necessarily the same in other universes. Thus anything is supposedly possible somewhere.

“[the Multiverse hypothesis] popularized in David Deutsch’s book *The Fabric of Reality* ... postulates the simultaneous existence of many, possibly infinitely many, parallel universes in which (almost) anything which is theoretically possible will ultimately be actualized, so that there is nothing surprising in the existence of a universe like ours” (John Lennox, *God’s Undertaker*, p. 74).

The bottom line is that there is no scientific evidence whatsoever for a multiverse.

“Let us recognize these speculations for what they are. They are not physics, but in the strictest sense, metaphysics. There is no purely scientific reason to believe in an ensemble of universes” (John Polkinghorne, *One World*, 1986, p. 80).

Multiverse was invented for the sole reason of avoiding the necessity of the Almighty Creator of the Bible.

“Several factors are combining to increase belief (of the ‘faith’ variety, not the ‘demonstrated fact’ variety) in the multiverse among materialists. ... At the biological level materialists are beginning to understand that the probability that life arose by random material processes is so low (estimated in this article written by materialists to be 10 raised to -1018) that infinite universes are required for it to have occurred, the implication being that we just happen to live in the ever-so-lucky universe where it all came together. At the cosmological level, the probability that the fine tuning of the universe necessary for the existence of life arose by sheer coincidence is so low that again the multiverse is invoked to provide infinite

‘probabilistic resources’ to do the job” (Barry Arrington, “Multiverse Mavens Hoisted on Own Petard,” *Uncommon Descent*, March 6, 2010).

The mathematician Dr. David Berlinski, who describes himself as a secular Jew, acknowledges that there is no evidence for a multiverse.

“The Landscape has, after all, been brought into existence by assumption. It cannot be observed. It embodies an article of faith ... There are by now thousands of professional papers about the Landscape, and reading even a handful makes for the uneasy conviction that were physicists to stop writing about the place, the Landscape, like Atlantis, would stop existing--just like that. This cannot be said of the sun” (David Berlinski, *The Devil’s Delusion*, pp. 119, 128).

Dr. Paul Davies explains that it would be impossible to detect a multiverse:

“Where are the other universes? The short answer is, a very long way away. It is a prediction of the inflation theory that the size of a typical bubble [containing one universe] is fantastically bigger than that of the observed universe. By fantastically, I mean ‘exponentially’ bigger. Our observed universe is likely to be deeply embedded in a region some 10 to the 10 billionth power kilometers across! Compare this with the size of the observable universe, a mere 10 to the 23rd power kilometers across. And if by some magic we could be transported to the edge of our bubble, we wouldn’t encounter the universe next door. Instead, there would be a region where space is still inflating, doubling in size every 10 to the minus 34 seconds or faster. So even though pocket universes like ours are expanding, they won’t intersect because they are being moved apart by inflation in the gaps between them much faster than their boundaries are growing. It is thus physically impossible, even for light, to cross the widening gulf between them” (*The Goldilocks Enigma*, p. 95).

To mock Theists who believe in God and to charge them with being unscientific and then to appeal to a wild-eyed multiverse for which there is not a speck of evidence is the height of evolutionary folly. As Berlinski observes:

“After all, the theologian need only appeal to a single God lording over it all and a single universe--our own. [Richard] Dawkins must appeal to an infinitely many universes crammed into creation, with laws of nature wriggling indiscreetly and fundamental physical parameters changing as one travels from one corner of the cosmos to the next, the whole entire gargantuan structure scientifically unobservable and devoid of any connection to experience” (*The Devil’s Delusion*, p. 153).

Philosopher Richard Swinburne is just as emphatic about the ridiculousness of the multiverse doctrine,

“To postulate a trillion-trillion other universes, rather than one God, in order to explain the orderliness of our universe, seems the height of irrationality” (Richard Swinburne, *Is There One God*, 1995, p. 68).

Cosmologist Edward Harrison adds,

“Take your choice: blind chance that requires multitudes of universes, or design that requires only one” (*Masks of the Universe*, 1985, p. 252).

Further, the multiverse hypothesis solves nothing in that it does not answer how or why *any* universe came into existence.

Quantum Cosmology

The supposed evidence for the multiverse comes from “quantum cosmology,” which is a metaphysical abuse of quantum physics. It has become a favorite god of some 21st century evolutionists, including Richard Dawkins, to explain how the universe could come from nothing.

Quantum physics has given us such mind-numbing and incomprehensible concepts as “quantum fuzziness,” “maybe-

space-maybe-time fuzziness,” “eternal inflation,” and “the bubble bath universe.”

Quantum and theoretical physicists are the modern Gnostics, delving into mysteries they cannot understand and pretending knowledge they don’t possess. Asking foolish questions and making foolish assumptions, they arrive at foolish answers.

David Berlinski gives a clever critique of quantum cosmology in his book *The Devil’s Delusion*.

The details may be found in [Stephen] Hawking’s best-selling *A Brief History of Time*, a book that was widely considered fascinating by those who did not read it, and incomprehensible by those who did. Their work will seem remarkably familiar to readers who grasp the principle behind pyramid schemes or magical acts in which women disappear into a box only to emerge as tigers shortly thereafter.

The wave function of the universe cannot be seen, measured, assessed, or tested. It is purely a theoretical artifact. Physicists have found it remarkably easy to pass from speculation about the wave function of the universe to the conviction that there is a wave function of the universe.

... the doctrines of quantum cosmology are what they seem: biased, partial, inconclusive, and largely in the service of passionate but unexamined conviction.

A Catechism of Quantum Cosmology

Q: From what did our universe evolve?

A: Our universe evolved from a much smaller, much emptier mini-universe. You may think of it as an egg.

Q. What was the smaller, emptier universe like?

A: It was a four-dimensional sphere with nothing much inside it. You may think of that as weird.

Q. How can a sphere have four dimensions?

A: A sphere may have four dimensions if it has one more dimension than a three-dimensional sphere. You may think of that as obvious.

Q. Does the smaller, emptier universe have a name?

A: The smaller, emptier universe is called a de Sitter universe. You may think of that as about time someone paid attention to de Sitter.

Q. Is there anything else I should know about the smaller, emptier universe?

A: Yes. It represents a solution to Einstein's field equations. You may think of that as a good thing.

Q. Where was that smaller, emptier universe or egg?

A: It was in the place where space as we know it did not exist. You may think of it as a sac.

Q. When was it there?

A: It was there at the time when time as we know it did not exist. You may think of it as a mystery.

Q. Where did the egg come from?

A: The egg did not actually come from anywhere. You may think of this as astonishing.

Q. If the egg did not come from anywhere, how did it get there?

A. The egg got there because the wave function of the universe said it was probable. You may think of this as a done deal.

Q. How did our universe evolve from the egg?

A. It evolved by inflating itself up from its sac to become the universe in which we now find ourselves. You may think of that as just one of those things.

This catechism, I should add, is not a parody of quantum cosmology. It *is* quantum cosmology.

Quantum cosmology is a branch of mathematical metaphysics. It provides no cause for the emergence of the universe, and so does not answer the first cosmological question, and it offers no reason for the existence of the universe. ...

[The string theory] was an idea that possessed every advantage except clarity, elegance, and a demonstrated connection to reality (David Berlinski, *The Devil's Delusion*, pp. 98-107, 119).

Conclusion

Well, there you have it for the Darwinian gods: Gaia, Urania, the Temple of Nature, the vast Unknown, cosmic intelligence, the revealing universe, the universe as mind, noosphere, panspermia, aliens, self-organization, autoevolution, the indeterminate sea of potentiality, the multiverse, and just plain *magic*!

Evolutionists get *really* weird when they start speculating about a “higher power” apart from the God of the Bible.

Darwin's Social Influence

The Darwinian world view is the foundational underpinning of modern Western society, with its worship of self, sexual revolution, and culture of death. Darwinian evolution is at the heart and soul of the legalization of abortion, euthanasia, homosexuality, marijuana, pornography, and more.

Harvard scientist Ernst Mayr called Darwinism “perhaps the most fundamental of all intellectual revolutions in the history of mankind,” because “it affected every metaphysical and ethical concept” (“The Nature of the Darwinian Revolution,” *Science*, June 2, 1972).

Of course, Darwinism is not the only philosophy that has been responsible for change, but Darwinism comes with all of the authority of modern science. It is backed up by an awe-inspiring army of scientists, educators, media personalities, and philosophers.

Daniel Dennett calls Darwinism “a universal acid” that destroys other world views.

“... it eats through just about every traditional concept and leaves in its wake a revolutionized world-view” (Dennett, *Darwin's Dangerous Idea: Evolution and the Meanings of Life*, 1995).

This is not surprising when we consider the following Darwinian principles:

- Man is an animal, the product of blind chance, with no higher purpose and no greater value.
- Man is accountable only to himself. Darwin wrote in his autobiography that if one does not believe in God or an afterlife, that his rule of life is “only to follow those impulses and instincts which are the strongest or which seem to him the best one.”

- There is no God and no human soul. This destroys the value of religion.

- There is no basis for moral absolutes. This Darwinian principle is the foundation for moral relativism, the predominant philosophy of the 21st century.

- Man has evolved through the survival of the fittest. Darwin wrote that man arose “from the war of nature, from famine and death”; this argues against moral concepts such as the equality of man, justice, and compassion.

- Man is a product of his inherited properties and his environment; he has no soul and no free-will. This is the foundation for modern psychology’s downplaying of personal responsibility.

- There is no life after death. This results in a focus on this present life and on the pursuit of physical health above all; it was summarized by a television commercial in the 1960s which said, “If you’ve got your health, you’ve got just about everything.” The no life after death philosophy encourages “eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow you die.”

- The embryo is not fully human until late in its development. This has been one of the underpinnings of the pro-abortion movement.

So-called “social Darwinism” has taken a myriad of often conflicting forms, but every form has been based on these principles.

Darwin’s Influence on Philosophy

On the 150th anniversary of the publication of *On the Origin of Species*, Frederic Bouchard of the University of Montreal’s Department of Philosophy observed:

“In 300 years from now, there is a greater chance that Darwin will be taught in a philosophy class than Immanuel Kant. He produced a shock wave that transformed every aspect of our perception of the world and ourselves. It’s a revolution greater than the Copernican revolution. Darwin demonstrated that

human beings are the result of chance. We could have been radically different or not even exist. The world could have remained populated by dinosaurs or bacteria. Natural selection has no precise objective. If we are here it's because our ancestors were lucky" ("Darwin's Seminal Impact on Biology, Anthropology, Philosophy and Psychology," EurekaAlert, Feb. 10, 2009).

This fatalistic, man-is-an-accident, life-has-no-ultimate-purpose view, which has dominated philosophy since the 19th century, has a solid Darwinian basis.

Darwin's Influence on Christianity

Skepticism was already permeating Christianity in the 19th century before Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* appeared, but his evolutionary "theory" hastened the spread of doubt in the historicity of Genesis and thus of the entire Bible.

Henry Morris writes:

"[B]iblical Christianity was all but destroyed by evolutionism. The great universities that were originally founded to promote biblical Christianity (e.g., Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Brown, Dartmouth, and many others) are citadels of humanism today. Even more significantly, the large Christian denominations ... were thoroughly permeated with evolutionary philosophy in both faith and practice" (*The Long War Against God*, p. 98).

This evolutionary-fueled unbelief has even permeated "evangelicalism" since the 1950s. "Theistic evolution" is accepted at Wheaton College, Baylor University, Calvin College, and many other major evangelical schools. Wheaton biology professor Pattle P.T. Pun (yes, that's his name) complains about "recent creationists" because they "deny and belittle the vast amount of scientific evidence" ("A Theory of Progressive Creationism," *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation*, March 1987). Davis Young, professor of geology at Calvin, recommends that Christians "stop treating Genesis 1 and the flood story as scientific and historic

reports” (“Scripture in the Hands of Geologists,” Part II, *Westminster Theological Journal*, 1987, 49, p. 303).

Countless men and women have lost their faith the Bible because of Darwinism. This began in Darwin’s own lifetime with a vengeance.

Consider George Romanes. As a student at Cambridge he was an “out-and-out evangelical.” He wrote a prize-winning essay on *Christian Prayer and General Laws*, but under Darwin’s influence he lost his faith and became an “agnostic.” In a manuscript left unfinished at the end of his life he said that the doctrine of evolution had caused him to abandon religion (Romanes, *Thoughts on Religion*, edited by Charles Gore, p. 169). Romanes described his bewildered spirit in *A Candid Examination of Theism*. “He had embraced the ‘lonely mystery of existence’ with the ‘utmost sorrow’ ... The universe without God had ‘lost its soul of loveliness’” (Adrian Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 634).

Darwin’s Influence on Psychology

Charles Darwin foresaw that his idea of evolution would transform the field of psychology. In *On the Origins of Species*, he wrote:

“In the distant future, I see open fields for far more important researches. Psychology will be based on a new foundation, that of the necessary requirement of each mental power and capacity by gradation. Light will be thrown on the origin of man and his history.”

In this, Darwin was a prophet, though it is not light but darkness that has been thrown on man’s nature.

In his biography of prominent names in the field of psychology, Leonard Zusne praised Darwin and said that his books “spell out the basic assumption underlying psychology, namely that man is on a continuum with the rest of the animal world ... The evolutionary method ... is now the accepted and pervasive point of view in psychology” (*Names in the History of Psychology*, p. 112).

On the 150th anniversary of the publication of *On the Origin of Species*, Daniel Paquette of the University of Montreal's Department of Psychology observed:

"Just like sociobiology, evolutionary psychology is built on the premise that our thoughts and behaviors as well as our physical traits are the result of evolution and subject to the mechanisms of natural selection and sexual selection" ("Darwin's Seminal Impact," EurekaAlert, Feb. 10, 2009).

Darwinian evolution's influence on psychology is evident in its fundamental belief that man is an evolved animal. It is evident in the belief that there is no soul beyond the brain, that human behavior can be understood by studying the behavior of animals, that man's fears of God and hell are irrational and should be challenged, that there is no absolute moral code to which man is accountable, and that man's own self-esteem and sense of well-being is the most important thing in life.

Darwin himself pioneered some of these practices. In *The Descent of Man* (1871) he compared the mental and emotional attributes of animals to man, concluding that even man's moral consciousness and his fear of God evolved from animals, such as the instinct for the preservation of the herd and a dog's desire to please his master. Darwin continued this theme in *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals* (1872).

Darwin's book *Biographical Sketch of an Infant* (1877) was based on a detailed log that he kept on the development of his oldest child, who was born 37 years earlier. Darwin concluded that each child goes through stages of evolutionary growth, just as the embryo does in the womb (the Darwinian doctrine of recapitulation).

We can even identify Darwin's grandfather Erasmus as a major influence on psychology. Erasmus was a skeptic and a humanist who preached his doctrine of evolution in a popular two-volume set of books entitled *Zoonomia; or, the*

Laws of Organic Life (1794-96). The books went through many editions in England and America, with translations into German, Italian, French, and Portuguese. *Zoonomia* promotes the very concepts later popularized by Charles: natural selection, survival of the fittest, sexual selection, gradual transformation of species, homology, and vestigial organs. Erasmus believed that everything has risen from an original “living filament,” which had formed by “spontaneous vitality” in “the primeval ocean.”

In the second volume of *Zoonomia*, Erasmus branded religion and hell as psychological diseases. One of these supposed afflictions was named “*spes religiosa*” or “superstitious hope.” He called this a “maniacal hallucination,” an insanity that has produced “cruelties, murders, massacres” into the world. Another alleged psychological disease that Erasmus identified was “*orci timor*” or “the fear of hell.” He wrote, “Many theatric preachers among the Methodists successfully inspire this terror, and live comfortably upon the folly of their hearers” (*Zoonomina*, Vol. 2, p 379). Erasmus implied that all preachers of hell are hypocrites who preach for money, which is patently false. Jesus Christ preached about hell, for the very reason that hell is a reality and He came to earth to save men from the punishment that they deserve. Jesus certainly didn’t live comfortably. His payment for speaking the truth in love was the Cross. The earthly reward that Jesus’ disciples received for warning men to flee hell through faith in Christ was persecution and death. The same has been true for countless other Bible preachers in the two millennia since. The early Methodist preachers certainly did not preach for money; they were hounded and persecuted even by the established churches.

Sigmund Freud was “an ardent follower of Darwin.”

“In a 1915 paper, Freud demonstrates his preoccupation with evolution. Immersed in the theories of Darwin and of Lamarck, who believed acquired traits could be

inherited, Freud concluded that mental disorders were the vestiges of behavior that had been appropriate in earlier stages of evolution” (Daniel Goldman, “Lost Paper Shows Freud’s Effort to Link Analysis and Evolution,” *New York Times*, Feb. 10, 1987).

In *Darwin Day in America*, John Day observes:

“Freud’s theory of psychic determinism was just as materialistic as explicitly biological explanations of human behavior. Indeed, Freud took Darwinian biology as his foundation. Praising Darwinian biologists for demonstrating man’s ‘ineradicable animal nature,’ he made clear that psychoanalysis was designed to expose the unconscious roots of human behavior in man’s biological instincts, especially his drives for sex and self-preservation [Freud, *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis*, 1960]. Freud drew inspiration from the popular biology of his time for a number of his specific ideas. For example, he adapted for his purposes the now-discredited ‘law of ontogenesis,’ maintaining that ‘each individual repeats in some abbreviated fashion during childhood the whole course of the development of the human race’ [*A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis*, p. 209]. Freud even posited the existence of ‘primal phantasies,’ in which a person recalls ‘true prehistoric experiences’ that have been embedded in his heredity through the evolutionary process [Freud, *Generation Introduction to Psychoanalysis*, pp. 379-80]” (West, *Darwin Day in America*, pp. 55, 56).

The aforementioned George Romanes became a prominent psychologist, applying Darwinian principles to “the evolution of the mind” and helping to corrupt society through this lie. Romanes, Freud’s colleague, was given Darwin’s notes on animal behavior. He established the field of comparative psychology which “seeks to provide insights about human beings by studying the similarities and differences between human and animal psychological functioning” (“Charles Robert Darwin,” *Encyclopedia of Psychology*, April 6, 2001).

Evolutionary psychologists analyze human traits from a Darwinian perspective by asking four questions: How does the trait develop within an individual? How has this trait evolved? What function does it serve? And what triggers the behavior?

These questions are premised on the non-proven assumption that man has evolved from the animal kingdom. Obviously, if human traits were created rather than evolved, it would be impossible for psychology to come to the right conclusions.

The website of Christ's College, Cambridge, features a report entitled "Charles Darwin and Evolution." It describes "Darwin's impact on psychology."

"Understanding human behavior from an evolutionary perspective has opened many new fields. For example by comparing human infant behaviour with that of infant chimps we can ask questions about how the ability to interact socially develops, when infants learn to imitate or understand the intention of others, and what differences there are between human mental development and that of other apes. Other fields study sexual desire, sexual orientation, and mate choice. Parental care has also been a major field of study. We now have improved understanding of how parental care develops and what effects occur in children when it develops abnormally. We have an improved understanding of how people make decisions, why societies exist, and why so many people believe in a religion. IN SHORT ALL ASPECTS OF THE WAY WE VIEW OURSELVES AND OUR BEHAVIOUR HAVE BEEN TOUCHED BY DARWIN'S IMPACT ON PSYCHOLOGY. ... Studying psychology within an evolutionary framework has revolutionised the field, allowing different approaches to be unified under one banner" (http://www.christs.cam.ac.uk/darwin200/pages/index.php?page_id=e2, accessed April 4, 2011).

John Day observes that evolutionary psychology robs man of free will and destroys any absolute basis for morality:

“In more recent years, the burgeoning field of ‘evolutionary psychology’ has invoked Darwinian theory to offer biological explanations of such practices as rape and adultery. According to Randy Thornhill and Craig Palmer, ‘the ultimate causes of human rape are clearly to be found in the distinctive evolution of male and female sexuality.’ The same is true for casual sex and extramarital affairs. Evolutionary-psychology proponent Robert Wright argues that Darwin’s theory explains why husbands are much more likely to desert their wives than vice versa. ... An evolutionary-psychology textbook, meanwhile claims that casual sex is an evolutionary adaptation based not only on ‘obvious reproductive advantages ... to men’ but also ‘tremendous benefits to women’ [Wright, *The Moral Animal*] ... If fidelity and adultery both exist simply because they furthered the survival of the fittest genes, what objective basis do we have for preferring one trait over the other? And if human beings truly are ‘puppets’ to their genes, puppets whose ‘emotions are just evolution’s executioners’ (to quote Robert Wright), in what sense can people be blamed if they act according to their deepest impulses? One can’t appeal to their free will, because ‘free will is an illusion, brought to us by evolution’ [Wright, *The Moral Animal*, p. 350]. In the end, ‘we cannot escape our animal origins’ [Malcolm Potts and Roger Short, *Ever Since Adam and Eve: The Evolution of Human Sexuality*, 1999, p. 332]” (John Day, *Darwin Day in America*, p. 270).

Darwinian-based psychology has had a vast influence on modern society. It has influenced marriage, child training, education, business, criminal justice, nearly everything. And being wrong in its most fundamental principles it has lurched from error to error.

Darwin’s Influence on Communism

Hundreds of millions of people have perished at the hands of Marxist dictators such as Stalin, Mao, and Pol Pot, and their driving philosophy was Darwinian evolution. They have

treated men like animals because Darwin taught them that men are animals.

Karl Marx called Darwin's doctrine of evolution "the basis in natural history for our view" (J.D. Bernal, *Marx and Science*, 1952, p. 17). Marx boasted that Darwin had given the doctrine of God "the death blow" (Gertrude Himmelfarb, *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution*, p. 398). In 1873 Marx sent Darwin a copy of *Das Kapital* and asked permission to dedicate the next volume to him.

Engels wrote to Marx on December 12, 1859, "Darwin, whom I am now reading, is splendid" (Jacques Barzun, *Darwin, Marx, Wagner*, p. 8).

At Marx's funeral, Engels said that "as Darwin had discovered the law of organic evolution in natural history, so Marx had discovered the law of evolution in human history" (O. Ruhle, *Karl Marx--His Life and Work*, 1929, p. 366)

Lenin was a strict evolutionist and materialist. He concluded "that man's consciousness is a late evolutionary product of no fundamental significance" (Barzun, *Darwin, Marx, Wagner*, p. 221).

Thomas Huxley's *Principles of Evolution* was translated into Chinese by Yen Fu and was widely read, preparing the way for Maoism. Ilza Veith observes, "[I]t was Darwinism, speaking through Huxley, and made to appear organically related to ancient Chinese thought on evolution, that furnished the intellectual basis for China's great upheaval beginning in 1911" (Henry Morris, *The Long War Against God*, p. 222).

When Mao took over China in 1949, the first new textbook introduced to the school system "was neither Marxist nor Leninist, but Darwinian" (Michael Pitman, *Adam and Evolution*, p. 24).

Communists share foundational principles with Darwin. They hold a materialistic faith and reject the Bible, the God of

the Bible, and divine creation. They consider man an evolved animal.

The founders of communism believed that Darwin had delivered “the mortal blow” to the doctrine of God (David Jorafsky, *Soviet Marxism and Natural Science*, p. 12).

They believe in progress through survival of the fittest. “[L]ike Darwin, Marx thought he had discovered the law of development. He saw history in stages, as the Darwinists saw geological strata and successive forms of life. ... In keeping with the feelings of the age, both Marx and Darwin made struggle the means of development” (Jacques Barzun, *Darwin, Marx, Wagner*, p. 8).

Darwin's Influence On Eugenics And The Modern Culture Of Death

The eugenics movement, which served as a great change agent in creating the modern culture of death, was Darwinian through and through.

Eugenics sought to advance the human race through breeding. It was seen as a way for man to “take control of his own evolution and save himself from racial degeneration” (Horatio Hackett Newman, University of Chicago zoology professor, *Evolution, Genetics, and Eugenics*, 1932, p. 441).

“Not only did many leading Darwinists embrace eugenics, but also most eugenicists--certainly all the early leaders--considered eugenics a straightforward application of Darwinian principles to ethics and society” (Richard Weikart, *From Darwin to Hitler*, p. 15).

While some have tried to distance eugenics from Darwinism, Darwin himself laid out its basic principles, which is the improvement of humankind through controlled breeding.

“With savages, the weak in body or mind are soon eliminated; and those that survive commonly exhibit a vigorous state of health. We civilized men, on the other

hand, do our utmost to check the process of elimination; we build asylums for the imbecile, the maimed, and the sick: we institute poor-laws; and our medical men exert their utmost skill to save the life of every one to the last moment. There is a reason to believe that vaccination has preserved thousands, who from a weak constitution would formerly have succumbed to small-pox. Thus the weak members of civilized societies propagate their kind. No one who has attended to the breeding of domestic animals will doubt that this must be highly injurious to the race of man. It is surprising how soon a want of care, or care wrongly directed, leads to the degeneration of a domestic race; but excepting in the case of man himself, **hardly any one is so ignorant as to allow his worst animals to breed** (*The Descent of Man*, p. 873).

Darwin was bemoaning the fact that the “weak in body and mind” are not eliminated from the human gene pool. He taught that men are mere animals and he wanted to see them treated like animals in the matter of breeding.

Darwin told Alfred Wallace, co-discoverer of the doctrine of natural selection, that he was depressed about the future of mankind because modern civilization allowed the unfit to survive and reproduce.

“[Darwin] expressed himself very gloomily on the future of humanity, on the ground that in our modern civilisation natural selection had no play, and the fittest did not survive. Those who succeed in the race for wealth are by no means the best or the most intelligent, and it is notorious that our population is more largely renewed in each generation from the lower than from the middle and upper classes” (“Human Selection,” in *Wallace, An Anthology*, p. 51).

Charles Darwin was not a brave man and he did not conduct a campaign for the control of human breeding, but he did call for voluntary restraint, saying that “both sexes ought to refrain from marriage if in any marked degree inferior in body or mind” (*The Descent of Man*). Since men

do not typically think of themselves as inferior, it is not surprising that Darwin's call went unheeded.

It was left for Darwin's family members to set the eugenics campaign in motion.

Darwin's cousin, Francis Galton (another grandson of Erasmus Darwin), founded the eugenics movement after reading *On the Origin of Species*. Galton invented the word "eugenics" (meaning "good breeding") and defined it as "the study of all agencies under social control which can improve or impair the racial quality of future generations." Galton believed that even moral and mental traits are the product of inheritance and called for "better breeding, as with 'horses and cattle,' to ensure that the 'nobler varieties of mankind' prevail over the feebler" (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 557).

Of course, men like Galton are elitists who consider themselves the cream of society and well capable of determining who is and is not fit. An elitist is willing to eliminate others (either actively through abortion, euthanasia, etc., or more passively through birth control), but the thought doesn't seem to cross his mind that he should volunteer himself for elimination.

Galton even saw eugenics as a new religion. One of his disciples, the famous playwright George Bernard Shaw, said in 1905 that "nothing but a eugenic religion can save our civilization" (Edwin Black, *War Against the Weak*, p. 28). Shaw was fascinated with Darwinism. He said, "The world jumped at Darwin."

Darwin's son Leonard was the president of the First International Congress of Eugenics. Leonard wanted to register the names of every "stupid" and otherwise "unfit" person in Britain. His plan envisioned that teachers would report "all children to be specially stupid." To this would be added the names of "all juvenile offenders awaiting trial, all ins-and-outs at workhouses, and all convicted prisoners" (Black, p. 215). Those so registered would be prohibited from propagating. Also, "their near kin were to be

shipped off to facilities, and marriages would be prohibited or annulled.”

Darwin’s son George called for the weakening of divorce laws, so that men and women could escape from a marital yoke with an “inferior” type. He also promoted contraceptives to cut down on “inferior” births.

Eugenics was also a major cause for Darwin’s daughter Ruth and her husband William Rees-Thomas, and for Darwin’s daughter Henrietta and her husband Robert Litchfield.

The eugenics movement in Germany, called the German Society for Race Hygiene, was founded by Alfred Ploetz, a staunch Darwinist and a follower of Darwin’s chief German disciple Ernst Haeckel. Ploetz told Haeckel that his race hygiene journal would “stand on the side of Darwinism” (Weikart, p. 15).

Wilhelm Schallmayer, who wrote one of the first eugenics pamphlets in Germany, said that “eugenics was indissolubly bound together with Darwinian theory” (Weikart, p. 15).

Division of men into classes of superior and inferior

Eugenicist August Forel called for dividing society into two categories: “a superior, more socially useful, sounder, or happier, and an inferior, less socially useful, less sound and happy.” Those in the “superior” division should reproduce bountifully, while those on the “inferior” side should refrain from reproducing (Weikart, *From Darwin to Hitler*, p. 131).

Gustav von Bunge, of the University of Basel, said “the procreation of sick, degenerate children is the most serious crime that a person could ever commit” (Weikart, p. 132).

Eugenicists sought to control the proliferation of the “inferior” through birth control, sterilization, abortion, sex education, restriction of marriage, and incarceration.

The eugenics program in America forced the **sterilization** of 60,000 “inferior” people. Its headquarters was the Station for Experimental Evolution at Cold Spring Harbor, New York, funded by the Carnegie Foundation to the tune of

millions of dollars. It was also funded from the Rockefeller fortune. The head of the U.S. movement was Charles Davenport, who wanted to breed a super race of Nordics. He was deeply concerned about the influx of the “blacks, browns, and yellows,” which he called “cheaper races” (Black, *War Against the Weak*, p. 37). When Davenport applied for funding from Carnegie, he complained, “We have in this country the grave problem of the negro, a race whose mental development is, on the average, far below the average of the Caucasian.” He proposed that “permanent improvement of the race can only be brought about by breeding the best.”

The Cold Spring Harbor center established the “Joint Committee to Study and Report the Best Practical Means of Cutting off the Defective Germ-plasm of the American Population.”

One of Davenport’s goals was the registration of every person in America, and eventually every person on the earth, recording the individual’s “blood line” and assigning him a eugenics racial rating. The plan was to assign an 11 digit number to each man, woman, and child which would indicate his or her rating.

The Eugenics Record Office was opened for business in 1910. “Its first mission was to identify the most defective and undesirable Americans, estimated to be at least 10 percent of the population.”

Secretary of Agriculture James Wilson, a staunch eugenicist, praised the Cold Water facility for “assembling the genetic data of thousands of families.” He said, “Those families which have in them degenerate blood will have new reason for more slowly increasing their kind. Those families in whose veins runs the blood of royal efficiency, will have added reason for that pride which will induce them to multiply their kind” (Black, p. 98).

This was based on animal breeding and the Darwinian doctrine of natural selection. One eugenicist put it like this: “Every race-horse, every straight-backed bull, every premium

pig tells us what we can do and what we must do for man" (Black, p. 39). Another said, "May we not hope to ... lop off the defective classes below, and also increase the number of the efficient at the top?"

Those that the eugenicists wanted to "lop off" included epileptics, the poor, American Indians, blacks, paupers, criminals, the insane, the deformed and defective (such as the blind, deaf, and mute), and the "feeble minded." The latter was a "eugenically damning classification" that included severely retarded individuals as well as "those who were simply shy, stuttering, poor at English, or otherwise nonverbal, regardless of their true intellect or talent." In fact, if the eugenicists couldn't shoehorn someone considered inferior into one of the previous categories, there was always the catch-all class called "other defectives."

The eugenics purification movement sought to sterilize not only the "unfit" themselves but also their extended families. "Even if those relatives seemed perfectly normal and were not institutionalized, the breeders considered them equally unfit because they supposedly carried the defective germ-plasm that might crop up in a future generation" (Black, *War Against the Weak*, p. 58).

The first three states to adopt eugenic sterilization were Washington, Connecticut, and California, all in 1909. Many other states followed suit.

A test case in 1924-25 went all the way to the Supreme Court, which ratified the eugenics program. A Virginia teen named Carrie Buck was declared "feeble-minded" even though she was a good student and a conscientious and hard worker. She was labeled feeble-minded simply because her mother, Emma, had been so declared and incarcerated in a government facility for life (though there was no evidence that Emma was actually feeble-minded), and because Carrie had gotten pregnant out of wedlock. Though she said that she had been raped, local officials deemed her unfit for society and placed her in the Colony for Epileptics and

Feebleminded. Carrie's newborn daughter, Vivian, was also labeled "feebleminded" on the basis of a social worker's testimony that "there is a look about it that is not quite normal, but just what it is, I can't tell" (Black, p. 115). Actually, it wasn't Vivian that was feebleminded; it was this eugenics social worker! The Colony determined to sterilize Carrie as "the probable potential parent of socially inadequate offspring." When the case came before the Supreme Court, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., ruled in favor of Carrie's sterilization, setting down in his opinion the memorable words, "Three generations of imbeciles are enough."

A major problem with this statement is that there was clear evidence that Carrie and her mother and daughter were anything but imbeciles. (Vivian, who was raised by an adoptive family, was an honor roll student until she died at age eight.)

Chief Justice Holmes was a staunch Darwinist who applied the doctrine of evolution to American law. He "reviled 'dogooders'" and did not believe in "the sacredness of human life." He was fond of the slogan, "... all society rests on the death of men; if you don't kill 'em one way you kill 'em another--or prevent their being born" (Black, p. 120). A plainer statement of the philosophy underlying the modern culture of death has never been made. It is obvious that we live in the "perilous times" prophesied in 2 Timothy 3 when America's Chief Justice talked so flippantly and confidently about killing people.

True to its Darwinist character, the eugenics movement was promoted through the use of bogus "facts" and devious art. Henry Goddard's influential book *The Kallikak Family: A study in the Heredity of Feeblemindness* (1913) featured "a series of photographs of nefarious-looking and supposedly defective Kallikak family members." The photos had been "doctored, darkening and distorting the eyes, mouths, eyebrows, nose and other facial features to make the adults

and children appear stupid.” This allowed Goddard to “portray the Kallikaks as mental and social defectives” (Black, *War Against the Weak*, p. 77).

The eugenics movement enjoyed the support of many prominent people, such as Alexander Graham Bell, John Kellogg (whose brother, Will, invented Kellogg cornflakes), H.G. Wells, George Bernard Shaw, Winston Churchill (who attended the First International Congress on Eugenics), Henry Osborn (head of the American Museum of Natural History and president of the Second International Congress of Eugenics), and Theodore Roosevelt. In 1913, Roosevelt wrote to Davenport, “I agree with you ... that society has no business to permit degenerates to reproduce their kind” (Black, p. 99). Churchill advocated segregating Britain’s 120,000 “feeble-minded persons” in colonies “so that their curse died with them and was not transmitted to future generations” (Black, p. 215).

Birth Control

The birth control movement was a product of eugenics. Margaret Sanger, founder of Planned Parenthood in 1919, sloganized, “More children from the fit; less from the unfit—that is the chief issue of birth control” (Diane Paul, *Controlling Human Heredity*, 1995, p. 20).

Sanger “vigorously opposed charitable efforts to uplift the downtrodden and deprived, and argued extensively that it was better that the cold and hungry be left without help, so that eugenically superior strains could multiply without competition from ‘the unfit.’ She repeatedly referred to the lower classes and the unfit as ‘human waste’ not worthy of assistance, and proudly quoted the extreme eugenic view that human ‘weeds’ should be ‘exterminated.’ ... In her 1922 book, *Pivot of Civilization*, Sanger thoroughly condemned charitable action. ... Sanger’s book included an introduction by famous British novelist and eugenicist H.G. Wells, who said, ‘We want fewer and better children ... we cannot make

the social life and the world-peace we are determined to make, with the ill-bred, ill-trained swarms of inferior citizens that you inflict upon us” (Black, pp. 127, 129, 130).

Sanger advocated mass sterilization and incarceration of the “unfit.” She wanted to control the population through birth control and sex education. She also advocated abortion, infanticide, and euthanasia.

Calling large families “immoral,” she said, “The most merciful thing that the large family does to one of its infant members is to kill it” (Sanger, *Woman and the New Race*, chapter 5).

She also complained, “Nature eliminates the weeds, but we turn them into parasites and allow them to reproduce” (Black, p. 133).

The December 1924 issue of Sanger’s *Birth Control Review* featured the following chilling words by John Duvall, writing on “The Purpose of Eugenics”:

“It is interesting to note that there is no hesitation to interfere with the course of nature when we desire to eliminate or prevent a superfluity of rodents, insects or other pests; but when it comes to the elimination of the immeasurably more dangerous human pest, we blindly adhere to the inconsistent dogmatic doctrine that man has a perfect right to control all nature with the exception of himself.”

This position is perfectly consistent with Darwinism. If man is a mere evolved germ, it could not be wrong to refer to him as a pest or a weed.

“Sanger surrounded herself with some of the eugenics movement’s most outspoken racists and white supremacists. Chief among them was Lothrop Stoddard, author of *The Rising Tide of Color Against White World Supremacy*. Stoddard’s book, devoted to the notion of a superior Nordic race, became a eugenic gospel. ... Shortly after Stoddard’s landmark book was published in 1920, Sanger invited him to join the board of directors of her American Birth Control

League, a position he retained for years” (Black, *War Against the Weak*, p. 133).

Sanger’s influence continues through her writings, through Planned Parenthood, and through her relatives, as we will see.

Abortion

The abortion movement was also a product of Darwinian eugenics.

“The biggest impact of Darwinism on the abortion debate came through eugenics discourse, which, as we have seen, was founded on Darwinian principles. Eugenics provided important impetus for those promoting the legalization of abortion. Most of the leading abortion advocates--Stocker, Schreiber, Furth, Olberg, and others--were avid Darwinian materialists who saw abortion not only as an opportunity to improve conditions for women, but also as a means to improve the human race and contribute to evolutionary progress. Stocker and her League for the Protection of Mothers consistently used eugenics arguments to support the legalization of abortion, though ultimately they wanted to allow abortion for non-eugenics reasons as well. Eduard David, in an essay on ‘Darwinism and Social Development,’ argued that eugenics was the proper social response to Darwinism, and he approved of abortion as one eugenics measure among others. Lily Braun likewise became a strong advocate of both eugenics and abortion” (Weikart, *From Darwin to Hitler*, p. 157).

In 2004, Margaret Sanger’s grandson Alexander Sanger, Chair of the International Planned Parenthood Council, published *Beyond Choice: Reproductive Freedom and the 21st Century*. He said “abortion is good,” arguing that abortion on demand is biologically justified because it aids the human race in its struggle to survive. “We cannot repeal the laws of natural selection. Nature does not let every life form survive. Humanity uniquely, and to its benefit, can exercise some

dominion over this process and maximize the chances for human life to survive and grow. ... we must become proud that we have taken control of our reproduction. This has been a major factor in advancing human evolution and survival” (pp. 292, 302).

Though Planned Parenthood today disavows its racist roots, the eugenics movement has been effective in culling the black population. According to a 2011 report by the New York City Department of Health, 59.8 percent of African-American pregnancies there in 2009 ended in abortion. That approaches genocidal levels of destruction.

The Darwinian doctrine of recapitulation, that the embryo goes through successive stages of evolution, has been used repeatedly to justify abortion.

Dr. Henry Morris wrote,

“We can justifiably charge this evolutionary nonsense of recapitulation with responsibility for the slaughter of helpless, pre-natal children--or at least for giving it a pseudo-scientific rationale” (*The Long War against God*, 1989, p. 139).

Darwin’s prominent German disciple Ernst Haeckel believed that the embryo is still in the evolutionary stage and not fully human. He said that it is “completely devoid of consciousness, is a pure ‘reflex machine,’ just like a lower vertebrate” (Weikart, p. 147).

Thus, killing an unborn baby would be like killing an animal.

In 1982, Dr. James Neel used Haeckel’s doctrine of recapitulation to testify *against* a proposed U.S. Senate “Human Life” bill that would have declared that “the life of each human being begins at conception.” Neel was chairman of the Department of Genetics at the University of Michigan Medical School, a member of the National Academy of Sciences, and had just been selected as president-elect of the Sixth International Congress of Human Genetics. He used his

impressive credentials to foist the fantasy of Darwinian recapitulation into the debate. He said:

“The early embryo appears to pass through some of the stages in the evolutionary history of our species. ... at about 30 days after conception, the developing embryo has a series of parallel ridges and grooves in its neck which are interpreted as corresponding to the gill slits and gill arches of fish. ... It has a caudal appendage which is quite simply labeled ‘tail’ in many textbooks of human embryology. ... [Because of these ‘facts’] it is most difficult to state, as a scientist, just when in early fetal development human personhood begins, just as I would find it impossible to say exactly when in evolution we passed over the threshold that divides us from the other living creatures” (cited from John Day, *Darwin Day in America*, pp. 325, 326).

John Day observes:

“Although Neel inserted a few qualifiers in his presentation (e.g., ‘appears’), the implication of his testimony was clear. He was arguing that the value of human embryos could be discounted because for much of their development they were equivalent to earlier stages in man’s evolutionary history” (*Darwin Day in America*, p. 326).

Sarah Weddington, the lawyer who argued for abortion in the landmark Supreme Court case *Roe v. Wade*, also testified against the “Human Life” bill, arguing that the fetus is a parasite. She said, “... the law presently allows no person ... the right to use the body of another in a parasitic way, as does the fetus” (*Darwin Day in America*, p. 332).

At the same hearing, Dr. Joseph Pratt, emeritus professor of surgery at the Mayo Medical School, also called the fetus “a parasite if you will.”

In 1990, Carl Sagan and his wife, Ann Druyan, argued that abortion is ethical on the grounds that the fetus is not fully human until the sixth month. Taking Haeckel’s recapitulation

“theory” as fact, they claimed that the embryo begins as “a kind of parasite” and changes into something like a fish with “gill arches” and then becomes “reptilian” and finally “mammalian.” By the end of the second month, the fetus “is still not quite human” (“Is It Possible to Be Pro-Life and Pro-Choice,” *Parade*, April 22, 1990).

The Sagans, too, described the fetus as a parasite. “... the fertilized egg ... destroys tissue in its path. It sucks blood from capillaries. It establishes itself as a kind of parasite on the walls of the uterus.”

Darwinism is the foundation upon which modern bioethics is built, with its belief that the human fetus has no more value than an animal.

Princeton bioethicist Peter Singer said, “On any fair comparison of morally relevant characteristics ... the calf, the pig, and the much derided chicken come out well ahead of the fetus at any stage of pregnancy--while if we make the comparison with a fetus of less than three months, a fish, or even a prawn would show more signs of consciousness” (*Practical Ethics*, 1979, p. 118).

Mary Anne Warren, philosophy professor at San Francisco State University, said that even a fully developed fetus “is considerably less personlike than the average mature mammal, indeed the average fish. ... if the right to life of a fetus is to be based upon its resemblance to a person, then it cannot be said to have any more right to life than, let us say, a newborn guppy” (“On the Moral and Legal Status of Abortion,” *Biomedical Ethics*, 4th ed., 1996, p. 437).

It is Darwinism and its ridiculous theories that the fetus is not fully human that has given us the vile practice of using fetuses as medical guinea pigs. John Day describes this in *Darwin Day in America*, pages 335-338.

At the Magee-Women’s Hospital in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in the 1960s, live fetuses were packed in ice while still moving and trying to breathe, then rushed to a laboratory for testing.

In the 1960s, Robert Goodlin of Stanford University submerged living fetuses in a saline solution and sliced open their chests in order to directly observe the beating heart.

In the 1970s, American medical researchers took part in a study of fetal-brain metabolism in Helsinki, Finland. The fetuses were removed via C-section and after their hearts stopped beating their heads were cut off and attached to a pump that circulated a chemical mixture through the arteries. Dr. Peter Adam of Case Western Reserve University in Ohio, who helped lead the Finnish study involving decapitation argued, "People need to understand that the fetus doesn't have the neurologic development for consciousness or pain." He said, "Once society has declared the fetus dead and abrogated its rights, I don't see an ethical problem."

Other researchers in Finland cut out the "fetus's" brain, lung, liver and kidneys while the heart was still beating -- without anesthesia.

In Hungary, university researchers cut out the beating hearts of fetuses up to 15 weeks for experimentation.

Bioethicist Mary Anne Warren said:

"While a fetus of five or six months may, perhaps, possess some flickering of sensation or some capacity to feel pain, this is equally true and probably even more true of creatures like fish or insects, which few would doubt the propriety of killing in order to save human lives" ("Can the Fetus Be an Organ Farm?" *Hastings Center Report*, Oct. 1978, pp. 23-24).

Bioethicist Michael Lockwood said:

"I should have thought that, from any sane point of view, it was far preferable to experiment on a near-microscopic blob of unfeeling protoplasm than a feeling, caring being, albeit of a different species" ("The Warnock Report: A Philosophical Appraisal," in *Moral Dilemmas in Modern Medicine*, 1985, p. 168).

All of this wickedness is based on the Darwinian concept of man as an animal.

Peter Singer said:

“All we are doing is catching up with Darwin. He showed in the nineteenth century that we are simply animals. Humans had imagined we were a separate part of Creation, that there was some magical line between Us and Them. Darwin’s theory undermined the foundations of that entire Western way of thinking about the place of our species in the universe” (Johann Hari, “Peter Singer--An Interview,” *The Independent*, Jan. 7, 2004).

“We can no longer base our ethics on the idea that human beings are a special form of creation, made in the image of God, singled out from all other animals, and alone possessing an immortal soul. ... once the religious mumbo-jumbo surrounding the term ‘human’ has been stripped away ... we will not regard as sacrosanct the life of each and every member of our species, no matter how limited its capacity for intelligent or even conscious life may be” (Singer, “Sanctity of Life or Quality of Life?” *Pediatrics*, July 1983).

Infanticide

Some of the eugenicists went even further, advocating infanticide.

As we have seen, Planned Parenthood founder Margaret Sanger advocated this.

Darwin disciple Ernst Haeckel taught that the newborn child has no soul and therefore infanticide “cannot rationally be classed as murder” (Haeckel, *The Wonders of Life*, 1904, p. 21). For physically or mentally handicapped infants, Haeckel recommended “a small dose of morphine or cyanide” (Weikart, p. 147).

Agnes Bluhm, the leading woman in the German eugenics movement, advocated infanticide (Weikart, p. 155).

Lily Braun also advocated infanticide for less than perfect children such as those with Down syndrome.

New York physicist William Robinson wrote, "The best thing would be to gently chloroform these children [of the unfit] or to give them a dose of potassium cyanide" (*Eugenics, Marriage and Birth Control*, 1917).

Peter Singer said:

"If the fetus does not have the same claim to life as a person, it appears that the newborn baby does not either, and the life of a newborn baby is of less value than the life of a pig, a dog, or a chimpanzee" (*Practical Ethics*, pp. 122, 123).

Leslie Olson, director of organ procurement for the University of Miami, said that an anencephalic baby named Theresa "better fit the category of benign tumor, rather than human being; she was a ball of tissue" (Mike Clary, "Baby Theresa's Gift: Debate over Organ-Harvesting Laws," *Los Angeles Times*, April 16, 1992, A5). Anencephalic babies are born with only their brain stems intact and usually are stillborn or survive only a few hours or days.

Nobel laureates Francis Crick and James Watson proposed that infants not be declared officially alive until three days after birth in order to allow the elimination of defective babies (*Darwin Day in America*, p. 340).

In 1915, infanticide became national news in America with the killing of a newborn by Dr. Harry Haiselden, chief of staff at the German-American Hospital in Chicago. Haiselden ordered the staff to deny all treatment to a baby born to Anna Bollinger. Catherine Walsh, who found the baby alone in a bare room, begged for the baby to be taken to its mother but was ignored. At an inquest, she testified, "It was a beautiful baby. I saw no deformities." The inquest determined that "a prompt operation would have prolonged and perhaps saved the life of the child" and that there was "no evidence that the child would have become mentally or morally defective" (Black, *War Against the Weak*, p. 253). The inquest refused, though, to punish the doctor, and the local prosecutor blocked efforts to indict him for murder.

Haiselden considered his vindication “a powerful victory for eugenics.” He “proudly revealed that he had euthanized other such newborns.” Taking courage from the refusal of the law to punish his murderous actions, “within two weeks he had ordered his staff to withhold treatment from several more deformed or birth-defected infants. ... Other times he would handle it personally, like the time he left a newly delivered infant’s umbilical cord untied and let it bleed to death. Sometimes he took a more direct approach and simply injected newborns with opiates” (Black, pp. 253, 254).

Eugenicist leader Charles Davenport praised the doctor, saying, “Shortsighted they who would unduly restrict the operation of what is one of Nature’s greatest racial blessings--death” (“Was the Doctor Right,” *The Independent*, Jan. 3, 1916).

Hollywood, which from its inception has been a great change agent in creating a society based on the new Darwinist morality, jumped on the “culture of death” bandwagon in 1917 with *The Black Stork*. This “unbridled cinematic propaganda was given a massive national distribution and promotion campaign. “Haiselden played himself in a fictionalized account of a eugenically mismatched couple who are counseled by Haiselden against having children because they are likely to be defective. Eventually the woman does give birth to a defective child, whom she then allows to die. The dead child levitates into the waiting arms of Jesus Christ” (Black, *War Against the Weak*, p. 257).

Euthanasia

Eugenists had a major influence on the founding of the Euthanasia Society of America (ESA) in the late 1930s.

“The ESA advisory council included not merely those ‘who had defended eugenics,’ but some of the most prominent leaders in the eugenics movement. These included Henry Goddard (the godfather of hysteria over

the ‘feeble-minded’), Arthur Estabrook (who testified in the Carrie Buck sterilization case), Albert Wiggam (eugenics popularizer extraordinaire), and even Margaret Sanger” (John Day, *Darwin Day in America*, p. 357).

In his eugenics lectures in 1910, George Bernard Shaw said:

“A part of eugenic politics would finally land us in an extensive use of the lethal chamber. A great many people would have to be put out of existence, simply because it wastes other people’s time to look after them” (Black, p. 248).

In 1900, W. Duncan McKim, a physician, wrote:

“Heredity is the fundamental cause of human wretchedness. ... The surest, the simplest, the kindest, and most human means for preventing reproduction among those whom we deem unworthy of this high privilege [reproduction], is a gentle, painless death. ... In carbonic acid gas, we have an agent which would instantaneously fulfill the need” (*Heredity and Human Progress*, 1900, pp. 120, 168).

In 1904, E.R. Johnstone, in his presidential address to the Association of Medical Officers of American Institutions for Idiotic and Feeble-minded Persons, said,

“Many plans for the elimination [of the feeble-minded] have been proposed” (Black, p. 250).

Paul Popenoe, leader of California’s eugenics movement, said:

“From an historical point of view, the first method which presents itself is execution. ... Its value in keeping up the standard of the race should not be underestimated” (*Applied Eugenics*, 1918, p. 184).

Madison Grant, president of the American Eugenics society, wrote:

“Mistaken regard for what are believed to be divine laws and a sentimental belief in the sanctity of human life tend to prevent both the elimination of defective infants and the sterilization of such adults as are themselves of no value to the community. The laws of nature require the obliteration of the unfit and human life is valuable only when it is of use to the community or race” (*The Passing of the Great Race*, 1916, p. 49).

A glaring question, of course, is who are the “unfit” and who makes the determination to obliterate them.

Charles Darwin, as we have seen, was a deeply depressed near invalid and his offspring did not exhibit any great superiority. “Of the ten, one girl, Mary, died shortly after birth; another girl, Anne, died at the age of ten years; his eldest daughter, Henrietta, had a serious and prolonged breakdown at fifteen in 1859. Three of his six sons suffered such frequent illness that Darwin regarded them as semi-invalid while his last son, Charles Jr., was born mentally retarded and died in 1858, nineteen months after birth” (Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 121).

In recent decades there have been major advances in euthanasia. This has been highlighted by high profile cases such as that of Terri Schiavo, who was starved to death in 2005 by court order. She was declared to be in a “persistent vegetative state” (PVS) and her feeding tube was removed. This was done even though some professional medical personnel testified that she was aware of her surroundings and responsive. This type of thing is happening frequently.

Some experts are arguing that death should be redefined merely as the cessation of “higher brain functions.” In other words, those declared in a “vegetative state” would be considered legally dead.

In arguing for this in the 1970s, bioethicist Joseph Fletcher used evolutionary grounds. He said humans have three brain parts--reptilian, mammalian, and human--which is pure

Darwinianism. If the so-called *human* brain is not functioning, then the person should be considered dead.

A 1996 survey found that 54% of medical directors and 44% of neurologists agreed that PVS patients “should be considered dead” (“Physicians Attitudes about the Care of Patients in the Persistent Vegetative State: A National Survey,” *Annals of Internal Medicine*, July 15, 1996).

Thus, thanks to the Darwinian-driven culture of death, the definition of death itself is being expanded.

John Day comments:

“Within the framework of scientific materialism, such an analysis is perfectly reasonable. If man is solely a physical being, what meaningful life exists apart from the physical functioning of his brain?” (*Darwin Day in America*, p. 352).

Richard Weikart has the following to say to those who are skeptical about the role that Darwinism has played in the creation of the modern culture of death:

“First, before the rise of Darwinism, there was no debate on these issues, as there was almost universal agreement in Europe that human life is sacred and that all innocent human lives should be protected. Second, the earliest advocates of involuntary euthanasia, infanticide, and abortion in Germany were devoted to a Darwinian worldview. Third, Haeckel, the most famous Darwinist in Germany, promoted these ideas in some of his best-selling books, so these ideas reached a wide audience, especially among those receptive to Darwinism. Finally, Haeckel and other Darwinists and eugenicists grounded their views on death and killing on their naturalistic interpretation of Darwinism” (*From Hitler to Darwin*, p. 161).

Eugenics and Hitler

Hitler had a great appreciation for the eugenics movement. He wrote letters of praise to Leon Whitney, president of the

American Eugenics Society, as well as to Madison Grant, author of *The Passing of the Great Race*. Hitler called Grant's book "his Bible" (Black, p. 259). In *Mein Kampf* ("My Struggle"), Hitler proposed his own program to "eliminate the germs of our physical and spiritual decay." He said, "The demand that defective people be prevented from propagating equally defective offspring is a demand of the clearest reason and, if systematically executed, represents the most humane act of mankind."

"In page after page of *Mein Kampf's* rantings, Hitler recited social Darwinian imperatives, condemned the concept of charity, and praised the policies of the United States and its quest for Nordic purity. Perhaps no passage better summarized Hitler's views than this from chapter 11: 'The Germanic inhabitant of the American continent, who has remained racially pure and unmixed, rose to be master of the continent; he will remain the master as long as he does not fall a victim to defilement of the blood' (Black, *War Against the Weak*, p. 275).

In the first decade of Hitler's regime, American eugenicists praised him.

"During the Reich's first ten years, eugenicists across America welcomed Hitler's plans as the logical fulfillment of their own decades of research and effort. Indeed, they were envious as Hitler rapidly began sterilizing hundreds of thousands and systematically eliminating non-Aryans from German Society. This included the Jews. Ten years after Virginia passed its 1924 sterilization act, Joseph DeJarnette, superintendent of Virginia's Western State Hospital, complained in the *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, 'The Germans are beating us at our own game.'

"Most of all, American raceologists were intensely proud to have inspired the purely eugenic state the Nazis were constructing. In those early years of the Third Reich, Hitler and his race hygienists carefully crafted eugenic legislation modeled on laws already introduced across

America, upheld by the Supreme Court and routinely enforced. Nazi doctors and even Hitler himself regularly communicated with American eugenicists from New York to California, ensuring that Germany would scrupulously follow the path blazed by the United States” (Black, p. 277).

Hitler conducted his eugenic program of racial purification with the assistance of IBM’s Hollerith data processing machines. In 1934, IBM opened a million-dollar factory in Berlin to manufacture the machines. “At the factory opening, the manager of IBM’s German subsidiary, Willi Heidinger, spoke vividly about what IBM technology would do for Germany’s biological destiny” (Black, p. 309).

Standing next to IBM president Thomas Watson’s personal representative, surrounded by Swastika flags and SS Storm Troopers, Heidinger made the following sick idolatrous statement:

“We are proud that we may assist in such task, a task that provides our nation’s Physician [Hitler] with the Material he needs for his examinations. Our Physician can then determine whether the calculated values are in harmony with the health of our people. It also means that if such is not the case, our Physician can take corrective procedures to correct the sick circumstances. ... Our characteristics are deeply rooted in our race. Therefore, we must cherish them like a holy shrine, which we will--and must--keep pure. We have the deepest trust in our Physician and will follow his instructions in blind faith, because we know that he will lead our people to a great future. Hail to our German people and *der Fuhrer!*”

The “corrective procedures” were a matter of public knowledge by then. The Dachau concentration camp had opened almost a year earlier, amid international news coverage. “Hitler’s atrocities against Jews and others were chronicled daily on the pages of America’s newspapers, by

wire services, radio broadcasts, weekly newsreels, and national magazines” (Black, p. 299).

By the power of IBM processors and borrowing registration plans drawn up by eugenicists in America, Hitler was able to identify those who had even a small percentage of Jewish blood.

“As the Hitler regime took each step in its war against the Jews and all of Europe, IBM custom-designed the punch cards and other data processing solutions to streamline those campaigns into what the company described as ‘blitzkrieg efficiency.’”

Arthur Keith, British anthropologist and co-discoverer of Piltdown Man, defended Hitler on the ground of evolutionary philosophy. He wrote, “The German Fuhrer, as I have consistently maintained, is an evolutionist; he has consciously sought to make the practices of Germany conform to the theory of evolution” (*Evolution and Ethics*, p. 28).

In his presidential address to the American Historical Association in 1918, William Roscoe Thayer stated:

“I do not believe that the atrocious war into which the Germans plunged Europe in August, 1914, and which has subsequently involved all lands and all people, would ever have been fought, or at least would have attained its actual gigantic proportions, had the Germans not been made mad by the theory of the survival of the fittest” (Weikart, p. 163).

Already in 1868, only seven years after the publication of *On the Origin of Species*, Friedrich Rolle, one of the earliest disciples of Darwin in Germany, wrote a book on human evolution in which he considered warfare a necessary part of the struggle for existence (Weikart, p. 167). Of the war that Otto von Bismarck engineered with Austria, Rolle said,

“With such magnificent events it is no longer a matter of right or blame, but rather it is a Darwinian struggle for

existence, where the modern triumphs and the obsolete descends into the paleontological graves" (Ibid.).

Many other German Darwinists said the same thing, as documented by Richard Weikart in the chapter on "War and Peace" in his book *From Darwin to Hitler*.

Gustav Jaeger justified wars of annihilation. David Strauss said war winnows nations according to their value. Friedrich Hellwald said the destruction of the weaker nations by the stronger "is a postulate of progress." Robert Byr said, "Whoever it may be, he must stride over the corpses of the vanquished; that is natural law." Klaus Wagner said war rids the world of "inferior" elements. Fraz Conrad von Hotzendorf said, "Right is what the stronger wills." Friedrich von Bernhardi called war a "biological necessity." Rudolf Cronau said the evolution of humanity progresses "by dint of the right of the stronger." Alfred Kirchhoff called for "extermination of the crude, immoral hordes." Oscar Schmidt said natural selection "is a pure question of might."

In the 1922 book *In His Image*, William Jennings Bryan, who ran for the U.S. presidency and who opposed evolution in the Scopes Trial, said that Darwinism helped "lay the foundation for the bloodiest war in history." Bryan observed that Darwinism leads to a denial of God and the abandonment of belief in a future life and thus destroys the stimulus to righteous living. He said that the German philosopher Nietzsche, with his doctrine of "might is right," "carried Darwinism to its logical conclusion." Nietzsche named Darwin as one of the three great men of his century. Bryan quoted an editorial that appeared in the Paris paper *L'Univers* in 1900 as follows:

"The spirit of peace has fled the earth because evolution has taken possession of it. The plea for peace in past years has been inspired by faith in the divine nature and the divine origin of man; men were then looked upon as children of one Father and war, therefore, was fratricide. But now that men are looked upon as children of apes,

what matters it whether they are slaughtered or not?" (*In His Image*, p. 124).

Bryan also cited Harold Begbie, who spoke of "the dark and disfiguring shadow of Darwinism" that had fallen on "the fields of life" (*The Glass of Fashion: Some Social Reflections*, 1921).

The preface to Begbie's book warned:

"Darwinism not only justifies the sensualist at the trough and Fashion at the glass; it justifies Prussianism at the cannon's mouth and Bolshevism at the prison-door. If Darwinism be true, if Mind is to be driven out of the universe and accident accepted as a sufficient cause for all the majesty and glory of physical nature, then there is no crime or violence, however abominable in its circumstances and however cruel in its execution, which cannot be justified by success, and no triviality, no absurdity of Fashion which deserves a censure..."

One book that effectively documents the destructive moral/social influence of Darwinism is *From Darwin to Hitler: Evolutionary Ethics, Eugenics, and Racism in Germany* by Richard Weikart (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004).

Weikart observes:

"Just because Darwinism does not lead inevitably to Nazism does not mean that we can strike Darwinism off the list of influences that helped produce Hitler's worldview and thus paved the way to the Holocaust. ... No matter how crooked the road was from Darwin to Hitler, clearly Darwinism and eugenics smoothed the path for Nazi ideology, especially for the Nazi stress on expansion, war, racial struggle and racial extermination. ...

"If one concentrates on anti-Semitism, surely an important part of Hitler's worldview, then there does not seem to be any direct connection between Darwinism and Nazism. ... However, if we focus more narrowly on the question of ethics, the value of human life, and racism, as I will do in the succeeding pages, the historical

connections appear more significant. Sheila Faith Weiss, after adequately demonstrating the Darwinian roots of eugenics, is probably right when she contends, ‘Finally, one might add, to categorize people as “valuable” and “valueless,” to view people as little more than variables amenable to manipulation for some “higher end,” as Schallmayer and all German eugenicists did, was to embrace an outlook that led, after many twists and turns, to the slave-labor and death camps of Auschwitz” (pp. 4, 6).

Another book that documents the intimate association between Darwinism and Hitler is *The Scientific Origins of National Socialism* by Daniel Gassman.

“[Hitler] stressed and singled out the idea of biological evolution as the most forceful weapon against traditional religion, and he repeatedly condemned Christianity for its opposition to the teachings of evolution. ... For Hitler, evolution was the hallmark of modern science and culture, and he defended its veracity as tenaciously as Haeckel” (Gassman, p. 168).

In *The Nazi Doctor: Medical Killing and the Psychology of Genocide*, Robert Lifton explains how Darwinist Ernst Haeckel’s racism and devaluation of life resulted in the destruction of conscience among Nazi doctors.

“Haeckel embraced a widely held nineteenth-century theme ... that each of the major races of humanity can be considered a separate species. ... Haeckel went so far as to say, concerning these ‘lower races’ (‘wooly-haired’ Negroes), that since they are ‘psychologically nearer to the mammals (apes and dogs) than to civilized Europeans we must, therefore, assign a totally different value to their lives” (p. 125).

As Shawn Boonstra observes:

“To suggest that atheism or Darwinism had nothing to do with it is just as ludicrous. It was not the Bible that gave the operators of the death camps the rationale they

needed to justify the mass execution of 'inferior' races. The belief that some races were genetically inferior--maybe even a different species--didn't come from the Christian scriptures. ... Let's be honest about it; the Bible did not fuel those ideas; they were fueled by the apostles of Darwin, the sketches of Haeckel, and the writings of the atheist philosopher Nietzsche" (*Out of Thin Air*, p. 53).

Darwin's Influence On Criminal Justice

The following is adapted from John West, *Darwin Day in America*, chapters 3-5:

Sociologist J.P. Shalloo said it was the "world-shaking impact of Darwinian biology, with its emphasis upon the long history of man and the importance of heredity for a clear understanding of man's biological constitution," that finally opened the door to a truer understanding of crime (West, pp. 58, 59).

Darwin's influence on criminal justice began in the late 19th century with the "new school of criminal anthropology," which "sought to use modern science to identify crime."

It was an application of Darwinism to the criminal justice field. The foundational philosophy is that man is an animal and is a product of his evolutionary path and his environment. There is no God, no absolute law, and no moral accountability. Man is not a creature made in God's image with a free will.

Italian criminologist Cesare Lombroso's *Criminal Mind* (1876) was a pioneering book in this field. "Lombroso and his disciples contended that criminal behavior could be explained largely as a throwback to earlier stages of Darwinian evolution." This is called *atavism*. One of Lombroso's disciples, James Weir, said, "Atavism has hurled him [the persistent criminal] back thousands and thousands of years, and has placed him beside his pithecoïd [ape] ancestor."

Lombroso attributed crime largely to organic factors, environment, and “congenital impulsiveness.” The goal should not be to punish but to cure. This was the beginning of the emphasis on rehabilitation in contrast to justice.

“Lombroso was a seminal figure in the founding of the scientific study of crime. Perhaps his most important role was helping to inaugurate criminology’s quest for the Holy Grail--the search for the material basis of crime. Although many of Lombroso’s particular findings were quickly superseded, the professional literature of the last hundred years is littered with studies purporting to identify the biological, chemical, psychological, and environmental causes of crime. That literature makes for interesting reading, because it shows the lengths to which social scientists were willing to go in applying the tenets of scientific materialism, even on the thinnest of evidence” (West, p. 53).

William Noyes wrote, “In the process of evolution, crime has been one of the necessary accompaniments of the struggle for existence” (“The Criminal Type,” *Journal of Social Science*, April 1888).

Enrico Ferri argued that “it was no longer reasonable to believe that human beings could make choices outside the normal chain of material cause and effect.” He “looked forward to the day when punishment and vengeance would be abandoned and crime would be treated as a ‘disease.’”

Criminal science is deeply influenced by modern psychology, with its view that man is an evolved animal and is not accountable to an absolute moral law. Sigmund Freud viewed man as a creature controlled by the unconscious which was formed through past experiences in this life as well as “prehistoric experiences” from his distant evolutionary past.

Summing up the view of modern psychology as a whole, John Staddon, professor of psychology at Duke University, said:

“Nearly all psychologists believe that behavior is completely determined by heredity and environment. A substantial majority agree with Skinner that determinism rules out the concept of personal responsibility. This opposition between determinism and responsibility is now widely accepted, not just by behaviorists but by every category of mental-health professional” (“On Responsibility and Punishment,” *The Atlantic Monthly*, Feb. 1995, pp. 89, 90).

“Regardless of the particular models adopted, criminologists almost universally agreed that free moral agency had nothing to do with crime, and that it was therefore nonsensical to talk as if criminals were somehow morally blameworthy for their actions” (West, p. 58).

John Cuber said: “Some criminals may commit criminal acts as a result of a chain of circumstances over which they have had no real opportunities to exert control. ... The better acquainted one becomes with the environmental forces which operate through culture and unique experience the less inclined he is to speak glibly about a person’s ‘responsibility’” (*Sociology: A Synopsis of Principles*, 1947).

Psychology’s influence on the criminal justice system has been magnified through the psychologizing of sin, e.g., drunkenness as alcoholism, drug abuse as illness, sex crimes as disease.

For example, in 1997 Mary Kay Letourneau, a married teacher who had a sexual relationship with a sixth-grade boy, was treated on her first offense with kid gloves because of psychology. She was found to have “bipolar disorder, which leads people to engage in risky behavior regardless of their consequences.” Supposedly, she has a “love button and a hypersexual button in her brain,” and “when it’s pressed, there is little room for self-reflection.” Because of this Darwinian psychological mumbo-jumbo her seven-and-a-half-year prison term was suspended and she received outpatient treatment in a sex-offender program. This is called

the “rehabilitative ideal” of modern criminal justice. Of course, therapy didn’t work and her “hypersexual button” eventually sent her to prison.

The concepts of probation and parole are derived from the rehabilitation emphasis. “The ‘soft’ side of rehabilitation could be seen in the expanded use of parole and probation, reforms long championed by advocates of the scientific approach to crime” (West, p. 81).

A 1964 textbook for parole and probation officers stated that there is no such thing as a “free deliberating sort of criminal” and claimed that the root causes of crime are “man’s natural desires for security, love, approval, and new experiences.” Thus, it’s all about self-esteem and man’s pursuit of it and the problems that come when he is thwarted in that pursuit. The textbook cautioned probation and parole officers against “the sin of being perceived as condemning or judgment.”

The concept of an “insanity” defense was also derived from humanistic psychology.

The new Darwinian view is brashly opposed to the old “religious” view of man as a free moral agent.

Sociologist J.P. Shalloo complained that the doctrine of the sinfulness of criminals “probably set back our understanding of human conduct at least 500 years.”

Criminologist Nathaniel Cantor ridiculed “the grotesque notion of a private entity, spirit, soul, will, conscience or consciousness interfering with the orderly processes of body mechanisms. ... The mechanisms of human behavior, though perhaps more complex, are subject to the same laws of cause and effect as the sun, moon, and other stars” (*Crime, Criminals, and Criminal Justice*, 1932, p. 265).

The modern “scientific” Darwinian criminal justice system has given us such things as lobotomy as a way to control behavior. Developed in America by neurologist Walter Freeman, lobotomy involved driving an ice pick into the brain just over the eyelid and then moving it around to

destroy tissue in the prefrontal lobes. By the 1960s lobotomy went high tech and electrodes were used to destroy the brain tissue. It was considered a panacea for mental illness and criminal tendencies. Between the 1940s and 1960s many prisoners were lobotomized. "Psychosurgeons were claiming for themselves a godlike power to redesign the human brain."

Electro-shock therapy was another attempt to control the mentally ill or criminal "animal."

Once that was debunked, the psychologists and criminal scientists lurched on to the next panacea, which was psychoactive drugs.

Today children as young as two years old are routinely prescribed Ritalin and similar behavioral therapy drugs. By 2000, an estimated four million American children were on the drug and in some schools the proportion of students on prescriptive psychoactive drugs was 30 or 40 percent.

Parents can even face legal threats if they refuse the recommendation of public school officials to put their children on Ritalin.

"In New York state, Michael and Jill Carroll wanted to take their seven-year-old son off of Ritalin for a two-week trial period because of the drug's serious side effects. They were reported to the state for child abuse by school authorities, and they then had to fight to clear themselves in family court. According to New York City attorney David Lansner, the Carrolls' experience is not unique. A member of Colorado's state board of education has described similar stories from her state in testimony before Congress" (West, pp. 100, 101).

"The tendency to reduce all behavioral problems to brain disorders that should be solved primarily through drugs is indicative of just how uncritically our society has embraced the philosophy of scientific materialism" (West, p. 101).

Darwin's Influence On Law

The practice of basing legal opinions on case study and legal precedent, rather than on a strict interpretation of the foundational legal documents, a practice which has made the judge the authority, was established by Christopher Langdell, an evolutionist who was made the dean of Harvard Law School in 1870 under Unitarian Darwinist Charles Eliot.

“This approach allowed the judges to become the lawgivers, instead of relying on the time-honored dependence on absolute principles of law--as defined by nature and nature's God and codified principally in William Blackstone's famous *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (first published in 1765). Langdell was followed by Roscoe Pound, both of whom became known as 'legal positivists.' Their most prominent disciple was probably Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, the man chiefly responsible for undermining the longstanding absolutes of the Constitution in Supreme Court decisions” (Henry Morris, *The Long War Against God*, p. 308).

In a speech in 1985, Chief Justice William Brennan, Jr. said that the “theory” of evolution is driving the new legal philosophy and that it is part of the cultural war against “the fetters of original intent or the literal words of the Constitution.” He said this “evolutionary process is inevitable and, indeed, it is the true interpretative genius of the text” (John Eidsmoe, “Creation, Evolution and Constitutional Interpretation,” *Concerned Women*, Sept. 1987, p. 8).

This, in turn, led to wretched legal decisions with far-reaching moral consequences such as the legalization of abortion, the removal of God from the public schools, the overturning of laws against homosexuality, and the dramatic weakening of the nation's pornography laws.

Darwin's Influence On Morality

The Western sexual revolution is based on the Darwinian philosophy that man is merely an animal and there is no

absolute code of morality to which he is accountable; morality evolved and is always relative.

In Darwin's day conservative Christians warned that evolutionary theories "would impair the welfare of society ... break down the best and holiest sanctions of moral obligation, and ... give a free rein to the worst passions of the human heart" (Adrian Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 38).

Adam Sedgwick, professor of geology at Cambridge, warned Darwin about trying to divorce nature from the "moral or metaphysical" and prophesied that if such a break were made "humanity would suffer a damage that might brutalize it, and sink the human race into a lower grade of degradation than any into which it has fallen since its written records tell us of its history" (Himmelfarb, p. 269).

Even Charles Lyell, the father of uniformitarian geology, was "tormented" over the fear that Darwin's doctrine would result in "human degradation." He "agonized about the moral consequences," fearing that "humanity would lose its noble rank and submerge in brutal nature" (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 442).

Countless others issued the same warning, and this is exactly what has happened. The ascent of atheistic evolution has been accompanied by unspeakable degradation and brutalization, from Stalin to Hitler to Mao to Pol Pot, from legalized abortion to child pornography. If man is an animal there is no reason why he should not pursue any inclination, and if there is no righteous Creator there is no basis for absolute morality.

Charles Darwin and Thomas Huxley believed that a moral code could be maintained even if one rejects the Bible and believes in naturalistic evolution, but they were wrong. There is no basis for absolute morality if there is no law-giving God. If man is a product of the blind forces of nature, he is no better than an animal and there is no ultimate reason why he should not act out any and every impulse.

Huxley lived to despise the nihilistic culture that he helped create. One evening the flamboyant homosexual Oscar Wilde came to Huxley's house with a coterie of his daughter Nettie's "self-obsessed hedonist" artsy friends. Wilde came "with his risqué quips," projecting all the "petulances and flippancies of the decadence, the febrile self-assertion, the voluptuousness, the perversity of the new Hedonism" (Desmond, *Huxley*, p. 540). Huxley responded, "That man never enters my house again."

In 1877, Annie Besant and Charles Bradlaugh were convicted of indecency for publishing a pamphlet advocating birth control. The British court characterized this pamphlet as not only indecent but also "lewd, filthy, bawdy and obscene." They were sentenced to six months in jail. Darwinism changed that type of thinking! By 1921, there was a birth control league operating in England and America. Darwinism had so dramatically changed society by the first half of the 20th century that not only birth control but abortion was legalized. It was legalized first in 1920 in Lenin's Soviet Union where evolution was the state religion. Today a Western court would probably not call anything "lewd, filthy, bawdy, and obscene," and certainly not birth control.

Finnish Sociologist Edward Westermarck (1862-1930), author of *History of Human Marriage* (1921), was inspired by Darwin in his doctrine of moral relativism.

"Directly inspired by Darwin's *Descent of Man*, Westermarck believed that marriage, as well as other human sexual behaviors, had developed through natural selection. ... Westermarck embraced moral relativism and cast doubt on the validity of certain Judeo-Christian sex taboos, including homosexuality and even bestiality. Westermarck predicted for the future 'that in questions of sex people will be less tied by conventional rules and more willing to judge each case on its merits, and that they will recognise greater freedom for men and women to mould their own amatory life'" (John Day, *Darwin Day in America*, p. 270).

Westermarck was right in his prediction. Each generation since Darwin has been “less tied by conventional rules” and has given “greater freedom for men and women to mould their own amatory life.”

Darwinism is a fundamental philosophical plank in the modern pop culture with its “do your own thing” philosophy.

Two of the great influencers of modern morality were Margaret Mead and Alfred Kinsey, both of whom were Darwinists.

Margaret Mead became the darling of the sexual revolution with the publication of her Darwinian book *Coming of Age in Samoa* (1928), a supposed scientific study proving that a Stone Age tribe in Samoa had no code of ethics, participated in casual sex, and suffered no guilt or stress. The latter was alleged to be the result of a lack of religion’s restrictive morality.

It turned out that Mead’s work was based on a lie and the Samoans in question, in fact, do have a strict moral code and a firm commitment to monogamy and fidelity in marriage.

After three failed marriages, Mead died in 1978 in the arms of a psychic faith healer.

As for Alfred Kinsey, it is impossible to calculate his influence as one of the fathers of the sexual revolution. *Time* magazine reported that Kinsey was hailed “as one of the greatest scientists since Darwin.” Someone said that the Kinsey Report “has done for sex what Columbus did for geography.”

The following is excerpted and adapted from *Darwin Day in America*:

“By the 1940s [Kinsey] had obtained funding for an extensive study of human sexual behavior from the National Research Council (an arm of the National Academy of Sciences), which in turn received its money for the project from the Rockefeller Foundation. It was this work on sex that would make Kinsey a household name.

"In 1948 he released *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, a mammoth volume containing more than eight hundred pages of graphs, charts, and descriptions of nearly every conceivable sexual practice among white American males. Unveiled with a publicity barrage that would have dazzled Madison Avenue, the book soon became the talk of the nation. ...

"Kinsey treated the 'human animal' as merely another type of mammal whose mating behavior could be fully explained in terms of biology and conditioning. Kinsey believed that biology had made the 'human animal' sexually omnivorous.

"Based on interviews with thousands of Americans, Kinsey claimed that half of all white married males had extramarital intercourse at some point in their marriages, and 'about 69 per cent of the total white male population ultimately has some experience with prostitutes.' Kinsey further reported that '37 per cent of the total male population has at least some overt homosexual experience' ... In addition, '10 per cent of the males are more or less exclusively homosexual.' ...

"Kinsey denied absolute morals and mocked the concept of 'abnormal,' writing, '... there is no scientific reason for considering particular types of sexual activity as intrinsically, in their biologic origins, normal or abnormal.'

"Kinsey dismissed as childish those who believed bestiality was immoral, and he suggested that taboos against bestiality originated in 'superstition.'

"He tended to regard all [traditional American sex] taboos as illegitimate efforts to repress man's biological nature.

"When it came to adult-child sex, Kinsey downplayed its seriousness and undermined the reasons for punishing it. In his view, the emotional upset caused by a child's sexual contact with an adult was no more serious

than the fright displayed by children ‘when they see insects, spiders, or other objects against which they have been adversely conditioned.’ Kinsey implied that the trauma of child-adult sexual contacts did not lie in the molestation itself but in the social disapproval that surrounded it. **‘If a child were not culturally conditioned, it is doubtful if it would be disturbed by sexual approaches...’** Kinsey suggested that the real blame for the trauma of child-adult sex should be assigned to ‘the emotional reactions of the parents, police officers, and other adults who discover that the child has had such a contact.’ Such reactions ‘may disturb the child more seriously than the sexual contacts themselves.’

“Kinsey also crusaded for greater leniency when it came to sex offenders, including those accused of child molestation, exposing themselves to children, extramarital activity, and bestiality.

Kinsey Debunked

“In retrospect, the uncritical embrace of Kinsey and his research was based more on fantasy than fact, as researcher Judith Reisman has extensively documented in her book *Kinsey: Crimes and Consequences* (2000). Perhaps the most egregious falsehood was the public image of Kinsey as the typical American family man.

“According to biographer James Jones, Kinsey expected his closest associates to engage in sex with each other and with each other’s wives. Not only that--they were expected to perform sexual acts on film while Kinsey watched. ... One wife of a Kinsey colleague complained of ‘the sickening pressure’ to have sex on film. ‘I felt like my husband’s career at the Institute depended on it,’ she recalled.

“Kinsey himself pursued ever more destructive sexual practices [sadoomasochistic homosexuality].

“He clearly had a personal stake in trying to justify his own private sexual demons to the world as something healthy and normal.

“Despite allowing his children to attend Sunday school, he hated ‘the Judaeo-Christian sexual tradition,’ and **he told his associate Clarence Tripp that ‘the whole army of religion ... is our central enemy.’ ... When asked once by Wardell Pomeroy whether he ‘really believed in God,’ Kinsey snapped, ‘Don’t be ridiculous. Of course not.’** A thorough-going scientific materialist, Kinsey dismissed the idea that life could continue after death. ‘I believe that when you’re dead, you’re dead, and that’s all there is.’

“Although Kinsey wrapped himself in the mantle of scientific respectability, his research turned out to be classic junk science.

“The Achilles’ heel of Kinsey’s study was its unrepresentative sample. ... One of the primary goals of the book [*Sexual Behavior*] was to convince people that a large proportion of the population engaged in practices typically regarded as abnormal or immoral. Yet Kinsey’s sample was in no way representative of the general male population. ...

“[Of the 4,120 men interviewed] 1,400 were convicted sex offenders in penal institutions, 199 were sexual psychopath patients, 329 were prisoners who were not convicted of sex offenses, several hundred were juvenile delinquents or otherwise ‘aberrant’ boys, 450 were homosexuals recruited from ‘homosexual communities,’ and an unspecified number were members of the ‘Underworld’ (bootleggers, con men, dope peddlers, gamblers, hold-up men, pimps, prostitutes, etc.).

“Judith Reisman has concluded that various deviant populations probably account for approximately 86 percent of the 4,120 males who actually appear in the tables of Kinsey’s book. ... there is no question that the

sample was blatantly unrepresentative of the population as a whole.

“Just how radically skewed Kinsey’s sample was finally became apparent as social scientists started to ask questions about sex practices in large, randomly sampled national surveys. While Kinsey claimed that ‘about 69 per cent of the total white male population ultimately has some experience with prostitutes,’ current survey data indicate that the proportion ... is 18.6 percent. ... According to recent survey research, the proportion of married males seventy and over who have ever had extramarital intercourse is 9.5 percent... But that was nothing compared to Kinsey’s wildly overblown statements about homosexuality. Contrary to his claim that ‘10 per cent of the males are more or less exclusively homosexual’ recent research indicates ‘that only about 2-3% of sexual active men ... are currently engaging in same gender sex’ and as few as 1 percent of men over eighteen identify themselves as ‘gay.’

Kinsey Remains Influential

“Unfortunately, the recent debunking of Kinsey’s research has done little to undo its widespread impact on American public policy. For decades, Kinsey’s data were largely accepted as good science, and as a result exerted a profound influence on the American legal and educational systems. In the field of criminal justice, Kinsey’s ideas were cited to justify decriminalizing or reducing the penalties of a wide range of sex crimes...

“When the American Law Institute developed the Model Penal Code (MPC) in the 1950s, it repeatedly cited Kinsey’s research to justify eliminating or reducing the penalties for various sex crimes.

“Despite recent withering critiques of Kinsey’s research methods, his work remains culturally influential. Hollywood celebrated it in the 2004 film *Kinsey*, starring Liam Neeson, and Kinsey’s research continues to be drawn on by many legal scholars, judges, and social

scientists. From 1982 to early 2000, there were nearly 5,800 citations of Kinsey in law reviews and journals abstracted in the Social Science Citation Index and the Science Citation Index” (John Day, *Darwin Day in America*, chapter 12, “Junk Science in the Bedroom,” pp. 271-290).

Kinsey and his Darwin-taught views had a powerful influence on the sex-education movement within the public school system. This began with the founding in 1964 of the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS) to provide sex instruction from kindergarten through high school.

“During the 1960s, SIECUS put out a series of study guides to help educators develop new sex-education curricula. These guides were later collected and published as essays in the book *Sexuality and Man* (1970). **Relying largely on Kinsey’s research (which they cited repeatedly), the SIECUS study guides followed Kinsey in invoking the authority of science to legitimize as normal sex behaviors traditionally regarded as abnormal or inappropriate.** In ‘Sexuality and the Life Cycle,’ SIECUS board members Lester Kirkendall and Isadore Rubin cited Kinsey’s data collected from pedophiles to establish that children are sexual beings from infancy and that preadolescent sexual activities are perfectly natural among children. ... In the SIECUS guide to homosexuality, Isadore Rubin similarly invoked [Darwinian] science to dismiss the views that homosexuality was a mental illness, maladaptive, or contrary to nature. ... Unquestionably the most disturbing SIECUS study guide was ‘Sexual Encounters between Adults and Children’ by SIECUS board member John Gagnon and William Simon. Gagnon and Simon consistently downplayed the negative consequences of child-adult sex, urged leniency for child molesters, and discouraged parents from reporting the sexual abuse of their children to police” (*Darwin Day in America*, pp. 295, 296).

Ever since the 1960s Darwinian social scientists have been using the public school system to brainwash generation after generation of students in the doctrine of moral relativism and sexual liberty. A 1971 SIECUS book, co-edited by SIECUS cofounder Lester Kirkendall, was well titled *The New Sexual Revolution*. The theme was that every sexual behavior exhibited by animals should be considered permissible and that traditional “religious” taboos are products of superstition. Kirkendall stated that he would like to drop the word “morality.”

Parents who have criticized sex education have been maligned as mean-spirited villains and “fundamentalist extremists” in bondage to outdated legalistic views.

In 1981, a group of sex education scholars published *Sex Education in the Eighties*. In one essay, Mary Calderone called for “the acceptance of the sexuality of children and infants” and said that children from their earliest years had to be trained for sexual pleasure. Even three year olds must be taught to “achieve ownership of their own bodies” and educated in how to “use their third human endowment, their sexuality.” Floyd Martinson said that incest could be a positive experience as long as it is practiced in “an educated, sophisticated, and carefully responsible manner.” Pedophilia need not create sexual trauma for the children. Another contributor counseled shifting the focus of sex education to younger children “before ignorance, fear, and guilt lead to poor judgment in sexual behaviors.”

In spite of the push back in the 1980s and 1990s by the “abstinence” movement, sex education in the public schools has continued to advance decade after decade along Darwinian, morally relativistic lines.

With the decriminalizing and mainstreaming of homosexuality, lesbianism, and transvestism an accomplished fact in American society by the first decade of the 21st century, after a half century battle, the next battleground appears to be pedophilia. We have often said

that if homosexuality is normalized, it will be impossible to treat any deviancy as immoral. If something as entirely unnatural as homosexuality is accepted, then *anything* must eventually be accepted. If it is alright for a man to marry a man simply because he is “attracted to” men, then what is to keep a man from having sex with a child or a dog or whatever he pleases, as long as there can be some pretense that the object of his lust doesn’t object? Alfred Kinsey showed the way that this can be accomplished by pretending that children are not so much traumatized by sexual predators as by the shock of parents and judicial investigators. He claimed that children are only disturbed by sexual encounters because of “cultural conditioning.”

As we have seen, Kinsey pioneered the attempt to decriminalize pedophilia in the 1940s and 1950s. This unspeakably vile campaign has made tremendous headway and is picking up steam within the perverted moral environment that Darwinism has helped create. A group of doctors and psychiatrists are using the same strategy that was successfully employed to normalize homosexuality in the public schools. The advocacy group B4U-ACT, which promotes pedophilia as just one more alternative sexual orientation, is pushing for the American Psychiatric Association to remove pedophilia from the list of mental defects, just as that organization did with homosexuality in the 1970s. The adult-child sex campaign wants to replace the term “pedophile” with the more innocent sounding “minor-attracted people.” Proponents include Dr. John Sadler of the University of Texas and Fred Berlin of Johns Hopkins University. J. Matt Barber, vice president of Liberty Counsel Action, says B4U-ACT is “the North American Man-Boy Love Association all dolled up and dressed in the credible language of the elitist Ph.Ds. ... These are the people who are the disciples of Alfred Kinsey” (*WorldNetDaily*, Aug. 22, 2011).

Darwinism is not the only factor in the modern sexual revolution; societies have been rebelling against God's moral laws since the first city was built by Adam's eldest son Cain, a murderer and a polygamist (Genesis 4:16-24). But there can be no doubt that turning man into an animal officially and "scientifically" has provided a major justification for man to live as an animal.

Additional Resources on Creation Science/Evolution

The following materials are available at the Evolution section of the Topical Database at the Way of Life web site:

- Darwinian Racism
- Using Creation Science Materials
- Evolution and Science Fiction
- Bible-believing Scientists
- Creation Science Videos
- Creation Science Books
- Creation Science Ministries: Why the New Evangelical Principle is Dangerous

The apologetics course “An Unshakeable Faith,” which is available from Way of Life Literature, deals with creation science and archaeology in the context of evangelism.

Way of Life Literature
P.O. Box 610368
Port Huron, MI 48061
866-295-4143
fbns@wayoflife.org
<http://www.wayoflife.org>

Canada: Bethel Baptist Church,
4212 Campbell St. N.
London, Ont. N6P 1A6
866-295-4143