



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,